arXiv:1211.1553v2 [math.KT] 8 Nov 2012

APPLYING GEOMETRIC K-CYCLES TO FRACTIONAL INDICES

ROBIN J. DEELEY, MAGNUS GOFFENG

Abstract. A geometric model for twisted K-homology is introduced. It is modeled after the Mathai-Melrose-Singer fractional analytic index theorem in the same way as the Baum-Douglas model of K-homology was modeled after the Atiyah-Singer index theorem. A natural transformation from twisted geometric K-homology to the new geometric model is constructed. The analytic assembly mapping to analytic twisted K-homology in this model is an isomorphism for torsion twists on a finite CW-complex. For a general twist on a smooth manifold the analytic assembly mapping is a surjection. Beyond the aforementioned fractional invariants, we study T-duality for geometric cycles.

Introduction

One of the motivating problems for the Atiyah-Singer index theorem was the search for an explanation for the integrality of the $\hat{A}$-genus of a spin manifold. The answer is that the $\hat{A}$-genus is the Fredholm index of the Dirac operator associated with the spin structure. Mathai-Melrose-Singer asked a similar question in their paper [24]. Namely, is there an index type interpretation of the $\hat{A}$-genus when there is no spin structure? The answer to this question required projective pseudo-differential operators and a pseudo-differential calculus with symbols given by sections of an Azumaya bundle. These operators have similar micro local structure as usual pseudo-differential operators, but the space of smoothing operators in this calculus does not form an algebra. However, they admit a tracial functional. The trace defines an invariant of elliptic elements in the calculus known as the fractional analytic index. The $\hat{A}$-genus of an oriented manifold was proven to equal the fractional analytic index of a projective Dirac operator in [24].

The proof of the Atiyah-Singer index theorem from [2] uses K-theory as a container for symbols of elliptic operators and the index theorem can be stated as the equality of two different types of indices, one topological and the other analytic. The topological index is a push-forward to a point, so even though K-theory is a generalized cohomology theory, it is used as a homology theory. To remedy this limitation, Atiyah constructed the analytic K-homology of a topological space in [1]. This construction was later generalized much further by Kasparov [20] to give KK-theory. Even though an elliptic operator easily gives a class in analytic K-homology, it is often difficult to extract explicit index theoretic information from such data. In the same spirit that integer homology is constructed from simple combinatorial data such as simplicial complexes, Baum-Douglas [4] introduced geometric K-homology which is built on data that have well understood index theory, spin^c-manifolds. From a geometric K-cycle one can assemble an abstract elliptic operator in analytic K-homology. This completed the picture as the Atiyah-Singer index theorem can be derived from a certain commutative diagram involving the assembly mapping; for more details, see [4]. Geometric K-homology with variations has proved to be useful in various other index problems: the index problem for the Heisenberg calculus [7], $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$-manifolds [12, 13] and $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-index theory [14, 17, 18].

The aim of this paper is to develop a construction similar to Baum-Douglas geometric K-homology for the fractional analytic index theorem of Mathai-Melrose-Singer. The resulting theory is refered to as projective K-homology. A projective cycle (M,E,φ) over a space X with a twist, i.e. a principle $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle $P\to X$ for a separable Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$, consists of three parts: a torsion twist M on a spin^c-manifold, a twisted K-theory class E and a mapping φ. The spin^c-manifold with a twist M is a principal $PU(k)$-bundle for some k over the spin^c-manifold $M/PU(k)$. The element E is an element of K-theory with the twist associated with M over $M/PU(k)$. Finally, the mapping φ respects the twist of X and M in the sense that it (after possible Morita equivalences) is an equivariant mapping $M\to P$; the precise definition is given in Definition 3.1. After defining a suitable equivalence relation we obtain a group $K_*^{proj}(P)$, see Definition 3.4. The assembly mapping from projective K-homology to twisted analytic K-homology can be constructed more or less in the usual way. The manifold $M/PU(k)$ carries a spin^c-Dirac operator that one twists by E. The resulting class is then pushed forward using φ. When X is a finite CW-complex and the twist is torsion, the assembly mapping is an isomorphism (see Theorem 3.6).

Examples of projective cycles naturally occur in various areas. When T-dualizing a circle bundle, one can construct projective cycles on the T-dual twisted space from geometric cycles on the total space of a circle bundle. We prove in Proposition 4.3 that T-dualizing geometric cycles into projective cycles produces a monomorphism on classes in general and an isomorphism if the circle bundle is flat. The construction implies that the assembly mapping is a surjection on the T-dual of a circle bundle. Our main example is that of the clutching construction for elliptic projective pseudo-differential operators. The clutching construction can be performed for torsion twists and gives an isomorphism between the twisted K-theory of the cotangent bundle, the container for K-theory data of symbols of elliptic projective pseudo-differential operators, and the projective K-homology. More details on this construction can be found in Theorem 4.7.

Our intention with this geometric model is two-fold. Not only is it isomorphic to twisted analytic K-homology (if the twist is torsion), but the cycles used to define it are of a rather general form. As such, these cycles appear naturally in a number of applications. In [28] (also see [10]), a geometric model for twisted K-homology is developed using cycles based on considerations from mathematical physics (in particular, D-branes). As such, the cycles are certainly naturally defined and have also found a number of applications (e.g., the foliation index theorem in [28]). On the other hand, a number of constructions considered here seem to require the flexibility offered by projective cycles; a prototypical example is the clutching construction discussed in the previous paragraph.

There is a natural way to obtain a projective cycle from a twisted geometric cycle. This association produces a natural transformation from twisted geometric K-homology to projective K-homology that we call the geometric modification mapping (see Theorem 5.2). We relate the geometric modification mapping to the assembly mapping in twisted geometric K-homology (see [28]). In particular, for smooth manifolds, the analytic assembly mapping on projective K-homology is surjective and the geometric modification mapping is injective (see Corollary 5.3).

Projective K-homology for torsion twists fits very well with fractional invariants. Every projective cycle for a torsion twist has a fractional projective index which only depends on its class in projective K-homology. Similarly, a twisted geometric cycle has a fractional geometric index only depending on the class in twisted geometric K-homology; in the picture of a D-brane, this can be thought of as a total charge. We prove in Theorem 6.6 that the fractional projective index, the fractional geometric index and the fractional analytic index are all equal. The construction of fractional indices from geometric K-cycles, both projective and twisted, unfortunately only makes sense for torsion twists. Precisely, in Subsection 6.2, we show that the de Rham class of the twist's Dixmier-Duoady class gives an obstruction to the bordism invariance of the fractional index.

Beyond the assemble of twisted analytic cycles from projective cycles, there are other analytic realizations of our cycles in the case of a torsion twist. To give a K-homological description of the fractional analytic index from a more analytic picture, we use rational geometric K-homology as a stepping stone. As the reader may recall (see [8]), the rational K-homology of X can be realized via $KK(C(X), D)$ where D is a UHF-algebra with K_0-group given by the rationals. Moreover, this KK-theory group can be realized using Baum-Douglas type cycles (see for example [27]); we refer to such a cycle as a rational geometric K-cycle. Since the twisted Chern character is a rational isomorphism for a torsion twist, we can in a direct fashion construct a rational geometric K-cycle from a projective cycle (see Definition 6.13). The fractional index of a projective cycle coincides with the index constructed from its rationalization as a rational K-homology class, i.e., as an index with values in the K-theory of the aforementioned UHF-algebra.

Let us make a few remarks about torsion assumptions on the twist. The definition of projective K-homology and constructions of examples work under no torsion assumption on the twist. However, our main results concerning the assembly mapping and fractional invariants are proved only for torsion twists. It is at this point not clear if projective K-homology is the correct model for non-torsion twists, but we include its definition due to the interesting examples. Another geometric model, one that fits well also with non-torsion twists, can be found in the preprint [3]. A number of constructions related to those considered in this paper are discussed in [3]. While there is some overlap between our results and those found in [3], we have concentrated more on specific applications while they concentrate more on the general theory. As such, these papers are, in fact, rather complementary.

The paper is organized as follows; in the first two sections, we recall some known concepts of projective vector bundles and its relations to twisted K-theory. Some results in these sections are formulated in a slightly new way to fit better with the rest of this paper. In Section 3, we introduce the projective cycles and projective K-homology and prove that the assembly mapping is an isomorphism for torsion twists. We consider examples coming from T-duality and the clutching construction in Section 4. The projective K-homology is compared to twisted geometric K-homology in Section 5. In the sixth and final section of the paper, fractional invariants are considered.

1. Principal $PU(n)$-bundles and projective bundles

1.1. **The group $PU(\infty)$.** The group of projective unitaries in n dimensions is defined as the group $PU(n) := U(n)/U(1)$, it forms a simple Lie group. If we identify $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ with the subgroup of $U(1) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ consisting of nth roots of unity, $PU(n)$ can also be realized as $SU(n)/(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$. If $n, n' \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an embedding

$$i_{n,n'} : U(n) \times U(n') \to U(nn'),\ (x, y) \mapsto x \otimes y.$$

Here we identify $U(nn') = U(\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^{n'})$. This mapping acts as multiplication on the centers. In particular, it induces a mapping $PU(n) \times PU(n') \to PU(nn')$. Another consequence is that if $n|n'$ there is an embedding $PU(n) \to PU(n')$. We will denote $PU(\infty) := \varinjlim PU(n)$.

If X is a Hausdorff space with a $PU(k)$-action we say that X is a $PU(k)$-space. Let us remark that since $PU(n)$ is a compact Lie group, the Slice Theorem implies that if X is a manifold with a free smooth $PU(n)$-action then the quotient $X/PU(n)$ is smooth and the mapping $X \to X/PU(n)$ is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle.

Definition 1.1. *A $PU(\infty)$-morphism from a $PU(n)$-space X to a $PU(n')$-space Y is a triple (f, X^U, Y^U) where the last two components consist of a $PU(n)$-invariant $U(l)$-bundle $X^U \to X$ and a $PU(n')$-invariant $U(l')$-bundle $Y^U \to Y$ such that $nl = n'l'$ and f is a $PU(nl)$-equivariant continuous mapping*

$$f : X^U \times_{PU(n)\times U(l)} PU(nl) \to Y^U \times_{PU(n')\times U(l')} PU(nl).$$

We say that (f, X^U, Y^U) is a $PU(\infty)$-diffeomorphism if all involved structures are manifolds and f is a diffemorphism.

The composition of two $PU(\infty)$-morphisms (f, X^U, Y^U) and (g, Y^U, Z^U), which are morphisms $X \to Y$ respectively $Y \to Z$, is defined as $(g \circ f, X^U, Z^U)$. Observe that the composition of two arbitrary morphisms is not well defined in general. The motivation for introducing this notion of a morphism is its similarity with Morita morphisms. We will return to this later in the context of Azumaya bundles.

We will use the notation $P^{fr} \subseteq P$ for the union of all open subsets on which the $PU(k)$-action is free.

Proposition 1.2. *If P is a metric $PU(k)$-space and $K \subseteq P^{fr}$ is compact, K has a $PU(n)$-invariant neighborhood U on which $PU(n)$ acts freely.*

Proof. Since K is compact, every point $x \in K$ has a $PU(n)$-equivariant neighborhood U_x such that $\mathrm{d}(U_x, (P^{fr})^c) > 0$. Compactness of K also implies that we may find finitely many $x_1, \dots x_n$ so that $U := \cup_{j=1}^N U_{x_j}$ is a $PU(n)$-equivariant neighborhood. This neighborhood clearly satisfies $\mathrm{d}(U, (P^{fr})^c) > 0$ and $U \subseteq P^{fr}$. $\square$

The short exact sequence of groups $0 \to \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \to SU(n) \xrightarrow{\pi} PU(n) \to 1$ defines a line bundle $L_n \to PU(n)$ via

$$L_n := SU(n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}.$$

The $SU(n)$-action on $PU(n)$ lifts to an $SU(n)$-action on L_n and induces an isomorphism of line bundles over $PU(n) \times PU(n)$

$$\gamma_{PU(n)} : m^*_{PU(n)} L_n \cong L_n \boxtimes L_n.$$

Here we use the notation $\boxtimes$ for outer tensor product of vector bundles.

Proposition 1.3. *If $\alpha : PU(n) \to PU(n)$ denotes complex conjugation, then $\alpha^* L_n = L_n^{-1}$.*

Proof. This is clear since complex conjugation inverts elements in the center $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ of $SU(n)$. $\square$

Proposition 1.4. *If $n, n' \in \mathbb{N}$, then as line bundles over $PU(n) \times PU(n')$*

$$(i_{n,n'})^* L_{nn'} = L_n \boxtimes L_{n'}.$$

Proof. We observe that $i_{n,n'}$ induces a well defined mapping $SU(n) \times SU(n') \to SU(nn')$. By construction

$$L_n \boxtimes L_{n'} = (SU(n) \times SU(n')) \times_{\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}/n'\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C},$$

The Proposition follows from the fact that $(\mathbb{Z}/nn'\mathbb{Z}) \cap i_{n,n'}(SU(n) \times SU(n')) = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n'\mathbb{Z}$. $\square$

Principal $PU(n)$-bundles over X are classified up to isomorphism by $H^1(X, PU(n))$. The short exact sequence $1 \to U(1) \to U(n) \to PU(n) \to 1$ and the isomorphism $H^2(X, U(1)) \cong H^3(X, \mathbb{Z})$ gives rise to a Bockstein mapping $\delta : H^1(X, PU(n)) \to H^3(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Since this mapping factors over $H^2(X, \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ it follows that $n\delta(P) = 0$

for any principal $PU(n)$-bundle P. The invariant $\delta(P)$ is known as the Dixmier-Douady invariant of P. A theorem of Serre (see [16]) states that the torsion in $H^3(X,\mathbb{Z})$ classifies principal $PU(k)$-bundles up to a $PU(\infty)$-isomorphism acting as the identity on the base X. Observe here that we are abusing the notation since a $PU(\infty)$-isomorphism need not preserve the rank k.

1.2. **Projective bundles.** In this subsection, P denotes a locally compact $PU(n)$-space. The mapping $\Delta_P : PU(n)\times P \to P$ will denote the action of $PU(n)$; so $\Delta_P(g,p) = gp$. Associativity of the action can be encoded in the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
PU(n)\times PU(n)\times P \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}\times\Delta_P"] \arrow[d, "m_{PU(n)}\times \mathrm{id}_P"] & PU(n)\times P \arrow[d, "\Delta_P"] \\
PU(n)\times P \arrow[r, "\Delta_P"] & P
\end{tikzcd},$$

where $m_{PU(n)} : PU(n)\times PU(n) \to PU(n)$ denotes multiplication in $PU(n)$.

Definition 1.5. *A projective bundle over P is a vector bundle $E \to P$ and an isomorphism*

$$\gamma_E : \Delta_P^* E \cong L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E \tag{1}$$

that satisfies the following associativity condition (as bundles over $PU(n)\times PU(n)\times P$):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\left(m_{PU(n)}\times \mathrm{id}\right)^* \Delta_P^* E \arrow[r, "\left(\mathrm{id}_{PU(n)}\times\Delta_P\right)^*\gamma_E"] \arrow[d, "\left(m_{PU(n)}\times \mathrm{id}_P\right)^*\gamma_E"'] & L_n^{-1}\boxtimes \Delta_P^* E \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}}\boxtimes\gamma_E"] \\
m_{PU(n)}^* L_n^{-1}\boxtimes E \arrow[r, "\gamma_{PU(n)}^{-1}\boxtimes \mathrm{id}_E"] & L_n^{-1}\boxtimes L_n^{-1}\boxtimes E
\end{tikzcd}$$

If the same holds when replacing L_n^{-1} with L_n we say that E is an opposite projective bundle.

The upper horizontal arrow is well defined since Δ_P is associative so

$$(\mathrm{id}_{PU(n)}\times\Delta_P)\Delta_P = \Delta_P(m_{PU(n)}\times \mathrm{id}_P)$$

and

$$\left(m_{PU(n)}\times \mathrm{id}\right)^* \Delta_P^* E = \Delta_P^*(\mathrm{id}_{PU(n)}\times\Delta_P)^* E.$$

The associativity condition can also be found in equation (17) of [23] in the following equivalent form. For $p \in PU(n)$, we set

$$\gamma_{E,p} := \gamma_E|_{p^*E} : p^*E \to L_{n,p}^{-1}\otimes E$$

If $p, p' \in PU(n)$, the associativity condition of [23] states that as mappings $(pp')^*E \to L_{n,pp'}^{-1}\otimes E$ one has that

$$\gamma_{E,pp'} = (\gamma_{PU(n)}\otimes \mathrm{id}_E)\circ(\mathrm{id}_{L_{n,p'}^{-1}}\otimes\gamma_{E,p})\circ p^*\gamma_{E,p'}.$$

Every projective bundle comes with a natural $SU(n)$-action defined as follows. If $a \in SU(n)$ with $p = a \mod U(1)$, then the action comes from

$$p^*E \to L_{n,p}^{-1}\times E \to E$$

where the last arrow is obtained from the trivialization ($L_{n,p}^{-1} \to \{p\}\times\mathbb{C}$) defined via a.

If E and E' are two projective bundles over P, then their direct sum $E\oplus E'$ is again a projective bundle with the obvious isomorphism $\gamma_{E\oplus E'} := \gamma_E\oplus\gamma_{E'}$. Let $Proj(P)$ denote the category of projective bundles over P. We also let $Proj^{op}(P)$ denote the category of opposite projective bundles. If P is a $PU(k)$-space we let P^{op} denote the space P with the complex conjugated $PU(k)$-action.

Proposition 1.6. *Complex conjugation of vector bundles defines an equivalence* $Proj(P) \cong Proj^{op}(P)$ *and complex conjugation of the action on* P *defines an equivalence* $Proj(P) \cong Proj^{op}(P^{op})$.

One can also stabilize projective bundles. Let $Q \to P$ be a $PU(n)$-invariant principal $U(l)$-bundle and $E \to P$ be a projective bundle. Then, $L_Q := Q \times_{U(1)} \mathbb{C} \to \tilde{Q} := Q/U(1)$ (this is the fiberwise version of L_n for Q). The quotient mapping $\pi_{\tilde{Q}} : \tilde{Q} \to P$ is a principal $PU(l)$-bundle over P. Furthermore, there is an isomorphism of line bundles $\gamma_Q : \Delta^*_{\tilde{Q}} L_Q \cong L_l \boxtimes L_Q$ which in local coordinates is given by the isomorphism $\Delta^*_{PU(n)} L_l \cong L_l \boxtimes L_l$. The bundle Q gives rise to a new $PU(nl)$-space $P^Q := \tilde{Q} \times_{PU(n)\times PU(l)} PU(nl)$ and a new vector bundle

$$E^Q := (\pi^*_{\tilde{Q}} E \otimes L_Q^{-1}) \times_{PU(n)\times PU(l)} PU(nl) \to P^Q.$$

Proposition 1.7. *The vector bundle* E^Q *forms a projective bundle. The required isomorphism* $\gamma_{E^Q} : \Delta^*_{P^Q} E^Q \to L^{-1}_{nl} \otimes E^Q$ *is obtained from the equation*

$$\gamma_{E^Q}|_{\tilde{Q}} := \pi^*_{\tilde{Q}} \gamma_E \otimes \gamma_Q^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, whenever $Q \to P$ *is a* $PU(n)$*-invariant principal* $U(l)$*-bundle, stabilization of projective bundles defines an equivalence*

$$\zeta_Q : Proj(P) \xrightarrow{\sim} Proj(P^Q).$$

If $f : P \to P'$ is an equivariant mapping of $PU(n)$-spaces and $E \to P'$ is a projective bundle then f^*E equipped with the isomorphism $f^*\gamma_E$ is clearly a projective bundle on P. Projective bundles may also be pulled back along $PU(\infty)$-morphisms: if (f, Q, Q') is a morphism from P to P', we can define its $PU(\infty)$-pullback $f^*_\infty E := \zeta_{Q'}^{-1} f^*(E^Q)$ which is a projective bundle over P'.

Proposition 1.8. *If* $f : P \to PU(n) \times X$ *is an equivariant homemorphism,* $E \to P$ *is a projective vector bundle, and* $s_f : X \to P$ *denotes the section* $s_f(x) := f^{-1}(x, 1)$, *then* γ_E *defines an isomorphism* $E \cong f^*(L_n^{-1} \boxtimes s_f^* E) = f^*_\infty E$ *when viewing* f *as the* $PU(\infty)$*-morphisms* $(f, P, U(n) \times X)$.

Proof. If $(x, p) \in X \times PU(n)$, then

$$E_{f^{-1}(x,p)} = p^* E_{s_f(x)} \xrightarrow{\gamma_{E,p}} L^{-1}_{n,p} \otimes E_{s_f(x)}$$

defines the sought after isomorphism of vector bundles. □

Convention. *Henceforth, all* $PU(\infty)$*-morphisms are assumed to be equivariant as all involved operations constructed from a* $PU(\infty)$*-morphism depend naturally on its components.*

2. Projective K-theory

Before discussing K-homology, we recall some notions in K-theory. As in Atiyah's original definition of topological K-theory, we will use elliptic complexes. A projective elliptic complex over a locally compact $PU(k)$-space P is a triple (E_1, E_2, σ) where E_1 and E_2 are projective bundles such that $\sigma : E_1 \to E_2$ is a morphism of projective bundles which is an isomorphism outside a compact subset.

A morphism of projective elliptic complexes (E_1, E_2, σ) and (E_1', E_2', σ') is a pair of morphisms $E_1 \to E_1'$ and $E_2 \to E_2'$ that intertwines σ with σ'. Composition of morphisms is given by the obvious operation and an isomorphism of projective elliptic complexes is an invertible morphism. A projective elliptic complex of the form (E, E, id_E) is called an elementary projective elliptic complex. The sum of two projective elliptic complexes (E_1, E_2, σ) and (E_1', E_2', σ') is defined by

$$(E_1, E_2, \sigma) + (E_1', E_2', \sigma') := (E_1 \oplus E_1', E_2 \oplus E_2', \sigma \oplus \sigma').$$

If $f : P \to P'$ is a proper $PU(k)$-equivariant and (E_1, E_2, σ) is a projective elliptic complex over P', we define the pulled back projective elliptic complex along f by

$$f^*(E_1, E_2, \sigma) := (f^*E_1, f^*E_2, f^*\sigma).$$

If P is a principal $PU(k)$-bundle, we let $K^0_{proj}(P)$ denote the group of isomorphism classes of projective elliptic complexes over P modulo the elementary complexes. The higher projective K-groups are defined by $K^i_{proj}(P) := K^0_{proj}(P \times \mathbb{R}^i)$. Observe that if P is compact, $K^0_{proj}(P)$ is the Grothendieck group of isomorphism classes of projective bundles. The proof of the next Proposition is the same as in the ordinary setting.

Proposition 2.1. *Projective K-theory is a contra variant functor on the category of principal $PU(k)$-bundles that satisfies Bott periodicity $K^i_{proj}(P) \cong K^{i+2}_{proj}(P)$.*

The main reason for introducing projective bundles is the relation with twisted K-theory. This relation is explained in Section 1.3 of [23]. We include it for the sake of completeness. With a principal $PU(n)$-bundle $P \to X$ there is an associated Azumaya bundle on X defined via $\mathscr{A} \equiv \mathscr{A}(P) := P \times_{PU(n)} M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Recall that an Azumaya bundle is a bundle of simple matrix algebras. A vector bundle $E \to X$ with a fiberwise action of $\mathscr{A}$ will be called an $\mathscr{A}$-module. By the Serre-Swan theorem there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathscr{A}$-modules that trivializes at infinity and projective finitely generated $C_0(X, \mathscr{A})$-modules.

If E is an $\mathscr{A}$-module, we can choose a cover (U_i) of X over which P and E trivializes. Since E is trivializable over U_i there is a vector bundle $E_i \to U_i$ such that as $\mathscr{A}|_{U_i}$-modules $E|_{U_i} \cong E_i \otimes \mathscr{A}|_{U_i}$. Since E is a vector bundle there are vector bundle mappings $G_{ij} : E_j \to E_i$ defined over U_{ij} and they satisfy the weak cocycle condition

$$\theta_{ijk} G_{ij} G_{jk} = G_{ik} \quad \text{on} \quad U_{ijk}. \tag{2}$$

Equation (2) can be taken as a definition for the $U(1)$-valued Cech 2-cocycle (θ_{ijk}). It is clear from the construction of the Bockstein mapping that the cohomology class of (θ_{ijk}) coincides with $\delta(P)$ under the isomorphism $H^3(X, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H^2(X, U(1))$. In [23], the collection (E_i, G_{ij}) is called a projective vector bundle data.

Theorem 2.2. *If P is a principal $PU(k)$-bundle there is a natural isomorphism $\iota_P : K^*_{proj}(P) \to K_*(C_0((X, \mathscr{A}(P)))$.*

We will prove this in the case that P is compact. The general case follows from the proof of the compact case we give below but is notationally more complicated.

Proof. The theorem follows if we prove that there is a one-to-one correspondence between projective bundles on P and $\mathscr{A}$-modules. If E is an $\mathscr{A}$-module we choose a cover (U_i) as above and trivializations $f_i : P|_{U_i} \to PU(n) \times U_i$ with associated transition functions g_{ij}. We define the vector bundle $\tilde{E}_i \to P|_{U_i}$ by $f_i^*(L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_i)$ and the morphism of vector bundles $\tilde{G}_{ij} : P|_{U_{ij}} \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(\tilde{E}_j, \tilde{E}_i)$ from the diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\tilde{E}_i \arrow[r, "\tilde{G}_{ij}"] & \tilde{E}_j \\
L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_i \arrow[u, "f_i^*"] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}} \boxtimes G_{ij}"] & L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_j \arrow[u, "f_j^*"']
\end{tikzcd}.$$

On triple intersections:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{G}_{ij}\tilde{G}_{jk} &= f_j^*(\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}} \boxtimes G_{ij})(f_i^{-1})^* f_k^*(\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}} \boxtimes G_{jk})(f_j^{-1})^* = \\ &= f_k^*(f_k^{-1})^* f_j^*(\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}} \boxtimes G_{ij})(f_i^{-1})^* f_k^*(\mathrm{id}_{L_n^{-1}} \boxtimes G_{jk})(f_j^{-1})^* f_i^*(f_i^{-1})^* = \\ &= f_k^*(\theta_{ijk} \boxtimes G_{ij}G_{jk})(f_i^{-1})^* = \tilde{G}_{ik}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\tilde{E}_i$ glues together to a vector bundle $\tilde{E} \to P$. We define the isomorphism $\gamma_i : \Delta_P^* \tilde{E}_i \to L_n^{-1} \boxtimes \tilde{E}_i$ by pulling back

$$\gamma_{PU(n)}^{-1} \boxtimes \mathrm{id}_{E_i} : m_{PU(n)}^* L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_i \cong L_n^{-1} \boxtimes L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_i.$$

It is clear that γ_i is associative and that $\tilde{G}_{ij}\gamma_j = \gamma_i \tilde{G}_{ij}$. Thus we can glue together the γ_i:s to an isomorphism $\gamma_{\tilde{E}} : \Delta_P^* \tilde{E} \to L_n^{-1} \boxtimes \tilde{E}$.

We will only sketch the converse. Assume that we are given a projective bundle $\tilde{E} \to P$. By Proposition 1.8 there are vector bundles $E_i \to U_i$ such that $\tilde{E}|_{P_{U_i}} \cong f_i^*(L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E_i)$, with the isomorphism depending on $\gamma_{\tilde{E}}$. A calculation similar to that above implies that $E_i \otimes \mathscr{A}|_{U_i}$ glues together to a vector bundle on X and the $\mathscr{A}|_{U_i}$-module structure in each chart glues together as well. □

In this paper, infinite-dimensional Azumaya bundles will also be of interest. They come from principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundles for a fixed separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. Motivated by Theorem 2.2, we will identify the two invariants $K^*_{proj}(P)$ with $K_*(C_0(X, \mathscr{A}(P)))$ and use the notation $K^*_{proj}(P)$ also for a general $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle.

Proposition 2.3. *If $Q \to P$ is a $PU(n)$-invariant principal $U(l)$-bundle, V_l denotes the fundamental representation of $U(l)$ and $V_l(Q) \to X$ the associated vector bundle, there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\mathscr{A}(P^Q) \cong \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathrm{End}(V_l(Q)).$$

Furthermore, under this isomorphism $\iota_{P^Q}(E^Q) = \iota_P(E) \otimes V_l(Q)$.

Proof. The statement follows by observing that

$$\mathscr{A}(P^Q) = P^Q \times_{PU(nl)} M_{nl}(\mathbb{C}) \cong Q \times_{PU(n)\times U(l)} (M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_l(\mathbb{C})) \cong \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathrm{End}(V_l(Q)).$$

□

2.1. **Cup products of projective bundles.** If $P \to X$ is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle and $P' \to X$ is a principal $PU(n')$-bundle, then their product (which is a principal $PU(nn')$-bundle) is defined via

$$PP' := (P \times_X P') \times_{PU(n)\times PU(n')} PU(nn') \to X.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $PP' \cong P'P$ as principal $PU(nn')$-bundles. There is a $PU(n) \times PU(n')$-equivariant embedding of manifolds $j_{P,P'} : P \times_X P' \hookrightarrow PP'$ and

$$\Delta_{PP'}|_{PU(n)\times PU(n')\times PP'} \circ (\mathrm{id}_{PU(n)\times PU(n')} \times j_{P,P'}) = j_{P,P'} \circ (\Delta_P \times_X \Delta_{P'}),$$

where we identify $PU(n) \times PU(n')$ with its image in $PU(nn')$.

If E is a projective bundle over P and E' a projective bundle over P', the tensor product $E \otimes E' \to PP'$ is as a bundle determined by the equation

$$j_{P,P'}^*(E \otimes E') = E \otimes_X E'$$

and the mapping $\gamma_{E\otimes E'} : \Delta_{PP'}^*(E \otimes E') \to L_{nn'}^{-1} \boxtimes (E \otimes E')$ is determined by using that $L_{nn'}|_{PU(n)\times PU(n')} = L_n \boxtimes L_{n'}$ and defining

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathrm{id}_{PU(n)\times PU(n')} \times j_{P,P'})^* \gamma_{E\otimes E'} := \\ &\qquad \sigma_{E,E'} \circ (\gamma_E \times_X \gamma_{E'}) : \Delta_P^* E \otimes_X \Delta_{P'}^* E' \xrightarrow{\sim} L_n^{-1} \boxtimes L_{n'}^{-1} \boxtimes (E \otimes_X E'),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sigma_{E,E'} : (L_n^{-1} \boxtimes E) \otimes_X (L_{n'}^{-1} \boxtimes E') \to L_n^{-1} \boxtimes L_{n'}^{-1} \boxtimes (E \otimes_X E')$$

is constructed simply by permutation of the fibers.

An important special case occurs when $P' = X$, then $E \otimes E' = E \otimes \pi_P^* E'$ where the tensor product on the right hand side is simply the tensor product of vector bundles on P and $\gamma_{E \otimes E'} = \gamma_E \otimes \mathrm{id}_{\pi_P^* E'}$. More generally, if P' is trivializable, every projective bundle on P' is of the form $(\pi_{P'})^*_\infty E_0$ for some vector bundle $E_0 \to X$ by Proposition 1.8. Here the pullback is as a stable mapping. In this case, $E \otimes \pi_{P'}^* E_0$ is in fact only the stable pullback of $E \otimes_X E_0$ from P to PP', the same is true if $\delta(P') = 0$.

Lemma 2.4. *The tensor product of projective bundles over principal bundles induces a bilinear mapping*

$$K^*_{proj}(P) \times K^*_{proj}(P') \to K^*_{proj}(PP').$$

The tensor product is associative on triple tensor products. Finally, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathscr{A}(PP') \cong \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes_X \mathscr{A}(P')$$

making the natural transformation ι_P multiplicative when equipping twisted K-theory with the usual cup product.

Proof. Since the tensor product is a biadditive and associative operation on the semigroup of projective bundles, the universal property of K-groups implies that the same properties holds for projective K-theory. That ι_P is multiplicative under the tensor product follows from the simple reason that

$$\begin{aligned} PP' \times_{PU(nn')} M_{nn'}(\mathbb{C}) &\cong (P \times_X P') \times_{PU(n) \times PU(n')} M_{nn'}(\mathbb{C}) \cong \\ &\cong (P \times_{PU(n)} M_n(\mathbb{C})) \otimes_X (P' \times_{PU(n')} M_{n'}(\mathbb{C})) \end{aligned}$$

and these isomorphisms commute with the construction of ι_P. □

2.2. **Push forwards.** In this subsection, the push forward of a projective bundle will be considered using the map ι_P and the approach in [10]. Smooth principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundles over a manifold with boundary are the objects of interest here. To simplify notation we will assume that the manifold X is even-dimensional, this can always be attained after taking cartesian product with S^1.

To construct the push forward, we will use the frame bundle $Fr(X) \to X$ of an oriented m-dimensional manifold which is the $SO(m)$-principal bundle of oriented frames on T^*X. The group $Spin(m)$ acts irreducibly on the space of spinors S_m via the complex spin representation. The space of complex spinors is 2^m-dimensional. The spin-group forms a two-fold cover of $SO(m)$. Thus we obtain a projective representation $SO(m) \to PU(2^m)$. Let

$$Pr(X) := Fr(X) \times_{SO(m)} PU(2^m) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{P} := Pr(X) \cdot P.$$

We use the notation $\mathbb{C}l(X)$ for the complex Clifford algebra bundle over X. One has that $\mathbb{C}l(X) = \mathscr{A}(Pr(X))$ and $\delta(Pr(X)) = W_3(X)$, the third integral Stiefel-Whitney class. A choice of spin^c-structure on X is a lift of $Fr(X)$ to a $Spin^c(m)$-bundle. This in turn produces a vector bundle $S_X \to X$ and an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}l(X) \cong \mathrm{End}(S_X)$.

Proposition 2.5. *There is a natural isomorphism of Azumaya bundles*

$$\lambda_P : \mathscr{A}(\tilde{P}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X).$$

In particular, a choice of spin^c-structure on X induces an isomorphism

$$\tilde{\iota}_P : K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K^*_{proj}(P).$$

This proposition follows directly from Lemma 2.4 and the fact that the bundle S_X associated with a spin^c-structure produces a Morita equivalence $\mathscr{A}(P) \sim_M \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X)$.

Definition 2.6. *If $f : P \to P'$ is a smooth proper equivariant mapping, we define the push forward*

$$f_! : K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \to K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}')$$

by declaring the following diagram to be commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \arrow[r, "f_!"] \arrow[d, "\lambda_P \circ \iota_{\tilde{P}}"] & K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}') \arrow[d, "\lambda_{P'} \circ \iota_{\tilde{P}'}"] \\
K_*(C(X, \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X))) \arrow[r, "f_!"] \arrow[d, "PD_X"] & K_*(C(X', \mathscr{A}(P') \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X'))), \arrow[d, "PD_{X'}"] \\
K^*(C_0(X^o, \mathscr{A}(P))) \arrow[r, "f_*"] & K^*(C_0(X'^o, \mathscr{A}(P')))
\end{tikzcd}$$

Our definition of push forward differs from the construction of push-forwards of [10] in a very subtle maner. This difference might at first seem trivial but plays a rather important role, for instance for the fractional index. We are considering equivariant mappings $f : P \to P'$ which in regards to K-theory contains two equally important pieces of information: the proper mapping on the base $f_0 : X \to X'$ and an isomorphism of $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundles $\Psi_f : P \cong f^*P'$. The difference between our construction and the one in [10] is that they work only with the mapping f_0 on the base which indeed induces a push-forward:

$$(f_0)_! : K_*(C(X, \mathscr{A}(f^*P') \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X))) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_*(C(X', \mathscr{A}(P') \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X'))).$$

Using all the data encoded in an equivariant mapping f, the push-forward of Definition 2.6 along f can be recovered from the push-forward of [10] along the base by

$$f_! := (f_0)_! \Psi_f.$$

The construction of the push-forward in [10] uses the fact that the mapping on the base f_0 can be factored over the zero section of a vector bundle, an embedding of an open subset and a trivial sphere bundle. Finally, the push-forward is defined on the factors separately. Let us explain what happens if P' is a vector bundle over P and $0 : P \to P'$ denotes the zero section. By assumption $P = 0^*P'$, $\Psi_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and

$$0_! : K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \to K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}'),$$

is conjugate via ι_P to the twisted Thom isomorphism $K_*(C(X, \mathscr{A}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X))) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_*(C(X', \mathscr{A}(P') \otimes \mathbb{C}l(X')))$. Furthermore, if $f : P \to P'$ is an embedding of spin^c-$PU(k)$-spaces then $f_! : K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \to K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}')$ is the composition of the Thom isomorphism $0_! : K^*_{proj}(\tilde{P}) \to K^*_{proj}(N_f)$ onto the horizontal normal bundle of f and extension by 0. The following Lemma is a direct consequence of the naturality of Poincaré duality:

Lemma 2.7. *Push forward commutes with pullback in the sense that if*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "q"] & P' \arrow[d, "p"] \\
P'' \arrow[r, "i"] & P'''
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes then the following diagram also commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd} K^*_{proj}(P') \arrow[r, "j^*"] \arrow[d, "p_!"] & K^*_{proj}(P) \arrow[d, "q_!"] \\ K^*_{proj}(P''') \arrow[r, "i^*"] & K^*_{proj}(P'') \end{tikzcd} .$$

2.3. **Example: Roots of line bundles.** As an example of how to construct a principal $PU(n)$-bundle we will use the exponential mapping $H^2(X,\mathbb{Q}) \to H^2(X,\underline{U(1)})$; we let $\underline{U(1)}$ and $\underline{\mathbb{R}}$ denote the constant sheafs. Observe that the Dixmier-Duoady class of such a principal bundle is 0 as the mapping $H^2(X,\underline{U(1)}) \to H^3(X,\mathbb{Z})$ vanishes on the image of $H^2(X,\underline{\mathbb{R}}) \to H^2(X,\underline{U(1)})$.

Let $\omega \in H^2(X,\mathbb{Q})$ and assume that we have chosen a Cech cocycle $(\omega_{\alpha\beta\gamma})$ on a good cover (U_α) representing it. There is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N\omega$ is in the image of $H^2(X,\mathbb{Z}) \to H^2(X,\mathbb{Q})$. In particular, there is a cochain $(u_{\alpha\beta}) \in C^1((U_\alpha),\mathbb{R})$ such that $(\mathrm{e}^{iu_{\alpha\beta}}) \in Z^1((U_\alpha),U(1))$ and

$$\mathrm{e}^{i\omega_{\alpha\beta\gamma}} = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{N}\left(u_{\alpha\beta}+u_{\beta\gamma}u_{\gamma\alpha}\right)}. \tag{3}$$

If N is large enough, we can find a cochain $(c_{\alpha\beta}) \in C^1((U_\alpha),U(N))$ such that

$$c_{\alpha\beta}c_{\beta\gamma}c_{\gamma\alpha} = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{i}{N}\left(u_{\alpha\beta}+u_{\beta\gamma}+u_{\gamma\alpha}\right)}.$$

Let us fix such a cochain $(c_{\alpha\beta})$ and let P_ω denote the principal $PU(N)$-bundle associated with the $PU(N)$-cocycle $(c_{\alpha\beta} \mod U(1))$. We will also let $L^N_\omega \to X$ denote the line bundle associated with the cocycle $(\mathrm{e}^{iu_{\alpha\beta}})$.

Proposition 2.8. *If L^N_ω is the line bundle constructed in the previous paragraph, then $c_1(L^N_\omega) = N\omega$.*

Proof. This is clear from equation (3). ☐

Proposition 2.9. *There is a projective line bundle $L_\omega \to P_\omega$ associated with the cochain $(u_{\alpha\beta}) \in C^1((U_\alpha),\mathbb{R})$ such that*

1. *$(L_\omega)^N$ is the lift of L^N_ω to P^N_ω.*
2. *The mapping $K^*(X) \ni E \mapsto E \otimes L_\omega \in K^*_{proj}(P_\omega)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. We define the projective line bundle $L_\omega \to P_\omega$ by gluing together the line bundles $U_\alpha \times L_N \to U_\alpha \times PU(N)$ along the 2-cocycle

$$c_{\alpha\beta} \exp\left(\frac{i}{N}u_{\alpha\beta}\right) : U_{\alpha\beta} \to U(N).$$

It is clear that the local isomorphism $\gamma_{\alpha,L} : U_\alpha \times \Delta^* L_N \to U_\alpha \times L_N \boxtimes L_N$ glues together to a global isomorphism

$$\gamma_L : \Delta^*_{P_\omega} L_\omega \to L_\omega \boxtimes L_N$$

satisfying the associativity condition.

That $- \otimes L_\omega$ gives an isomorphism follows from the fact that, if $\tilde{E} \to P_\omega$ is a projective bundle, then the vector bundle $\tilde{E} \otimes L^*_\omega$ descends to a vector bundle on M. ☐

Proposition 2.10. *If $\omega \in H^2(X,\mathbb{Q})$ then the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{tikzcd} K^*(M) \arrow[r, "-\otimes L_\omega"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{ch}"'] & K^*_{proj}(P_\omega) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{ch}_{P_\omega}"] \\ H^*_{dR}(X) \arrow[r, "\wedge \mathrm{e}^\omega"] & H^*_{dR}(X) \end{tikzcd} .$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.9 $(L_\omega)^N = \pi_{P_\omega}^* L_\omega^N$ and by Proposition 2.8 $\mathrm{ch}\,[L_\omega^N] = \mathrm{e}^{N\omega}$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{ch}_{P_\omega}[L_\omega] = \sqrt[N]{\mathrm{e}^{N\omega}} = \mathrm{e}^{\omega}.$$

The proposition follows from the multiplicativity of the Chern character. ☐

3. Projective K-homology

In this section, we define the projective cycles. They can be seen as an analogue of simplicial homology in twisted K-homology. A projective cycle, which is a building block in this homology theory, can be seen as locally capturing the projective structure of the $PU(\mathscr{H})$-space.

Definition 3.1 (Projective cycles). *Let P be a principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle or a $PU(n)$-space. We define a projective cycle (M,E,φ) over P as a closed spin^c manifold M with a free smooth spin^c-preserving $PU(k)$-action, $E \to M$ a projective bundle and $\varphi : M \to P$ a stable morphism.*

Even though the rank of a $PU(n)$-bundle is irrelevant for our purposes, we shall try to distinguish the notation between the rank of the fixed bundle P and that of the cycles M, they will be denoted by n and k respectively. An isomorphism of two projective cycles (M,E,φ) and (M',E',φ') is a pair (f_0,f_1) where f_0 is a stable $PU(\infty)$-diffeomorphism $M \to M'$ (recall Definition 1.1) that preserves spin^c-structures, $\varphi = \varphi' \circ f_0$ (composition in the sense of stable morphisms) and f_1 is an isomorphism $f_{0,\infty}^* E' \to E$. These cycles have the same natural operations as geometric cycles (see [4]), e.g. disjoint union.

More generally, one can consider projective cycles (M,E,φ) where $E \in K^0_{proj}(M)$. We will not dwell on this since after we quotient out by the direct sum/disjoint union relation these new cycles appear on their own.

Proposition 3.2. *If (M,E,φ) is a projective cycle then φ is a lift of a mapping $\varphi_0 : M/PU(k) \to X$ such that $\varphi_0^*\delta(P) = \delta(M)$ in $H^3(M/PU(k),\mathbb{Z})$ and an explicit homotopy between $\varphi_0^*\delta(P)$ and $\delta(M)$ can be constructed from φ.*

A direct consequence of the two-out-of-three lemma for spin^c-structures is that if $V_0 \to Y$ is an even-dimensional spin^c-vector bundle over a manifold Y and Y^{V_0} denotes the sphere bundle of $V_0 \oplus 1_{\mathbb{R}}$, a spin^c-structure on Y induces one on Y^{V_0}. If V_0 has a spin^c-structure, there is a fiberwise Bott class $\beta_{V_0} \in K^0(Y^{V_0})$. The case of interest to us is $Y = M/PU(k)$. Let $\pi_M : M \to M/PU(k)$ denote the projection and define $V := \pi_M^* V_0$. The projection mapping $\pi_{Y^{V_0}} : M^V \to Y^{V_0}$ is a principal $PU(k)$-bundle that respects the spin^c-structures. Let $\pi_{M^V} : M^V \to M$ denote the projection mapping.

Definition 3.3 (Vector bundle modification). *If (M,E,φ) is a projective cycle over P and $V = \pi_M^* V_0$ where $V_0 \to M/PU(k)$ is an even-dimensional spin^c-vector bundle, the projective cycle vector bundle modified by V from (M,E,φ) is*

$$(M,E,\varphi)^V := (M^V, \pi_{M^V}^* E \otimes \pi_{Y^{V_0}}^* \beta_{V_0}, \varphi \circ \pi_{M^V}).$$

If (W,E,φ) is a triple that satisfies all the conditions on a projective cycle except that W has a boundary, we say that the projective cycle $(\partial W, E|_{\partial W}, \varphi|_{\partial W})$ is null-bordant and call (W,E,φ) a projective bordism.

Definition 3.4. *We define $K_*^{proj}(P)$ as the group of isomorphism class of projective cycles modulo the equivalence relation generated by disjoint union/direct sum, bordism and vector bundle modification.*

The set $K_*^{proj}(P)$ is in fact a group; the inverse of (M,E,φ) is given by $-(M,E,\varphi):=(-M,E,\varphi)$, where $-M$ denotes M with the opposite spin^c-structure. The group $K_*^{proj}(P)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-graded group where the degree of a cycle (M,E,φ) is the dimension of (the connected components of) $M/PU(k)$.

3.1. **The projective analytic assembly mapping.** If (M,E,φ) is a projective cycle, and M has a $PU(k)$-action, we can consider the fundamental class $[M/PU(k)]\in K^*(C(M/PU(k)))$ and define the twisted cap product $[M/PU(k)]\cap \iota_P[E]\in K^*(C(M/PU(k),\mathscr{A}(M)))$. By definition, the stably equivariant mapping φ does, up to a stabilization by the endomorphisms of a specified vector bundle, satisfy that $\varphi^*\mathscr{A}(P)=\mathscr{A}(M)$. The pullback along the base φ_0^*P does not equal M so one really uses the equivariance of φ. In particular,

$$\mu(M,E,\varphi):=\varphi_*([M/PU(k)]\cap\iota_M[E])\in K^*(C_0(X,\mathscr{A}(P))).$$

is well defined as a mapping from projective cycles. Observe that if $P\to X$ is smooth and oriented, then by definition $\mu(M,E,\varphi)=[X]\cap\varphi_![E]$. To streamline notation, let $K_*^{an}(P):=K^*(C_0(X,\mathscr{A}(P)))$.

Proposition 3.5. *The mapping μ induces a well defined and natural mapping*

$$\mu: K_*^{proj}(P)\to K_*^{an}(P).$$

Proof. We need to show that μ respects the three equivalence relations in K_*^{proj}. It is clear that μ respects direct sum/disjoint union. If we vector bundle modify a cycle (M,E,f) along V, the modified cycle can be realized as $(M^V,s_!E,f\circ\pi)$ where $s:M\to M^V$ denotes the south pole mapping. But $\pi\circ s=\mathrm{id}_M$ and naturality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(M^V,s_!E,f\circ\pi)&=f_*\pi_*([M^V/PU(k)]\cap\iota_{M^V}s_![E])=\\&=f_*\pi_*s_*([M/PU(k)]\cap\iota_M[E])=\mu(M,E,f).\end{aligned}$$

To prove that the assembly mapping respects bordism, assume that (W,E,φ) is a projective cycle with boundary. Let $i:\partial W\hookrightarrow W$ denote the embedding. Let $\partial: K_*(W^o/PU(k))\to K_{*+1}(\partial W/PU(k))$ denote the boundary mapping. It is well-known that $\partial[W^o/PU(k)]=[\partial W/PU(k)]$, see for instance Theorem 4.7 of [5]. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\partial W,E|_{\partial W},\varphi|_{\partial W}):&=(\varphi\circ i)_*([\partial W/PU(k)]\cap\iota_{\partial W}[E|_{\partial W}])=\\&=\varphi_*\circ i_*\circ\partial([W^o/PU(k)]\cap\iota_W[E])=0,\end{aligned}$$

as $i_*\circ\partial=0$. □

The map μ is called the projective analytic assembly mapping; it is the main object of study in this section.

Theorem 3.6. *If P is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle over a finite CW-complex the projective analytic assembly mapping is an isomorphism.*

The proof of Theorem 3.6 is very similar to that of Theorem 3.11 of [6]. The similarity comes from the fact that [6] deals with equivariant geometric K-homology and the geometric properties of the manifold part of the cycles are very similar. The difference in the vector bundles that comes from the extra structure (1) (see page 4) does not matter since the isomorphism ι_P allows us to transfer the projective bundles to twisted K-theory where one has a similar toolbox with push-forwards and Poincaré duality. The details of the proof will occupy the remainder of this section.

Lemma 3.7. *There is a $PU(n)$-invariant retraction $P\xrightarrow{j}N\xrightarrow{p}P$ into a spin^c $PU(n)$-principal bundle N.*

Proof. Based on the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [6], there is a $PU(n)$-equivariant embedding of P into a complex $PU(n)$-representation W and for a small enough $PU(n)$-invariant neighborhood U of P there is a retraction $U \to P$. Furthermore, there is a $V \subseteq U$ that is a $PU(n)$-invariant manifold with boundary. We let N denote the double of V, $j : P \to N$ the obvious embedding and $p : N \to P$ the fold map composed with $U \to P$. The spin^c structure on N comes from the complex structure on W so it is compatible with the $PU(n)$-action. Since P is compact, we can assume that U is small enough so that $\mathsf{d}(U,(W^{fr})^c) > 0$ by Proposition 1.2 so the $PU(n)$-action on U is free. Thus N is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle by the Slice Theorem. □

This lemma allows us to define the mapping $\beta : K^*(C_0(X,\mathscr{A}(P))) \to K_*^{proj}(P)$ by

$$\beta(x) := [N, PD_N j_*(x), p].$$

Proposition 3.8. *The mapping β is well defined and natural.*

This is obvious for a fixed retract of P. The proof that μ is an isomorphism will consist of a proof that β is its inverse. From which, it will follow that β is independent of the retract.

Lemma 3.9. *If $(M,E,f \circ h)$ is a projective cycle such that $h : M \to N$ is a $PU(n)$-equivariant inclusion of spin^c-manifolds with normal bundle ν, the vector bundle modification of $(M,E,f \circ h)$ along $\mathbb{C} \oplus \nu$ is bordant to the vector bundle modification of $(N,h_!E,f)$ along $\mathbb{C}$.*

We will not prove Lemma 3.9 since the proof is the same as that of Theorem 4.1 in [6] mutatis mutandis; the same bordism can be used due to Lemma 2.7.

Lemma 3.10. *If P is a principal spin^c-$PU(n)$-bundle and (M,E,f) is a projective cycle over P,*

$$[M,E,f] = [P, f_!E, \mathrm{id}].$$

The proof is mutatis mutandis the same as the final paragraphs of Section 4 of [6] but since there is a small difference in the cycles, we include a sketch of this proof.

Proof. After stabilization, using the data contained in φ, we can assume that M is a $PU(n)$-bundle. Choose a $PU(n)$-equivariant embedding $j : M \to V$ into a complex $PU(n)$-representation V. Let V^+ denote the sphere in $V \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathrm{pr}_P : P \times V^+ \to P$ the projection onto the first coordinate. The mapping $h := f \times j : M \to P \times V^+$ is a $PU(n)$-equivariant embedding and $\mathrm{pr}_P \circ h = f$. The subtle difference to Section 4 of [6] is the requirement that the $PU(n)$-action on $P \times V^+$ is free; this is of course true since the action on P is free. The embedding j is homotopic to the south pole mapping $c : M \to V^+$ so $h_! = (f \times c)_!$. Using the functoriality of push forwards and Lemma 3.9,

$$\begin{aligned}[P, f_!E, \mathrm{id}_P] &= [P, f_!E, \mathrm{pr}_P \circ (\mathrm{id}_P \times c)] = [P, (\mathrm{id}_P \times c)_! f_!E, \mathrm{pr}_P] = \\ &= [P, h_!E, \mathrm{pr}_P] = [M, E, \mathrm{pr}_P \circ h] = [M,E,f].\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We will prove the claim that β is an inverse to μ. By naturality, we can assume that P is a $PU(n)$-spin^c-manifold. By Lemma 3.10, we have that

$$\beta\mu[M,E,f] = \beta([X] \cap f_![E]) = [P, f_![E], \mathrm{id}] = [M,E,f].$$

It follows that μ is injective with right inverse β. Finally, we observe that Poincaré duality implies that μ is surjective. So μ is a bijection and the uniqueness of inverses implies that β also forms a left inverse to μ. □

Our method of proof that μ is an isomorphism breaks down whenever the Dixmier-Duoady invariant is non-torsion. A similar type of result for non-torsion Dixmier-Duoady invariants that concerns the assembly in twisted geometric K-homology can be found in [28]; we discuss it below. In this case, one uses homotopy theoretic methods. Another approach, which can be found in [3], is to allow for general twisted K-theory data in the cycles. For the cycles in [3], the proof above goes through in the non-torsion case. In the case of non-torsion twist, it is unclear if the assembly mapping on projective cycles is an isomorphism. Despite this we will now give a class of examples of non-torsion Dixmier-Duoady invariant where it is surjective.

4. Examples

4.1. ***T*-duality and projective cycles.** A very direct way to construct projective cycles is on the T-dual of a circle bundle. We will take a C^*-algebraic approach to T-duality. For a general overview of T-duality, see [25]. Let us describe T-duality briefly; if $P \to Z$ is a principal $PU(\mathcal{H})$-bundle and $\pi : Z \to X$ is a principal circle bundle there is a T-dual principal $PU(\mathcal{H}\otimes L^2(S^1))$-bundle $P^T \to Z^T$ on the T-dual principal circle bundle $\pi^T : Z^T \to X$ and these satisfy the conditions

$$\pi_*\delta(P) = c_1(Z^T),\ \ \pi^T_*\delta(P^T) = c_1(Z) \text{ and } K_*(C(Z,\mathscr{A}(P))) \cong K_{*+1}(C(Z^T,\mathscr{A}(P^T))).$$

In the C^*-algebraic approach, one lifts the fiberwise $\mathbb{R}$-action on the circle bundle Z to an $\mathbb{R}$-action on $C(Z,\mathscr{A}(P))$, see Lemma 7.5 of [25]. The crossed product $C(Z,\mathscr{A}(P))\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ turns out to be a continuous trace algebra and one defines Z^T and P^T by

$$C(Z^T,\mathscr{A}(P^T)) := C(Z,\mathscr{A}(P))\rtimes\mathbb{R}.$$

The reason that T-duality shifts K-theory is the Connes-Thom isomorphism (see for example [8]). If A is an $\mathbb{R}-C^*$-algebra with $\mathbb{R}$-action α there is an associated short exact sequence of $\mathbb{R}-C^*$-algebras

$$0 \to C_0((0,1),A) \to C_0([0,1),A) \to A \to 0,$$

where the $\mathbb{R}$-action on A is trivial and on $C_0([0,1),A)$ the $\mathbb{R}$-action is defined by $s\cdot f(t) := \alpha_{st}(f(t))$. Since $\mathbb{R}$ is nuclear, crossed product by $\mathbb{R}$ is an exact functor. Using that $C_0((0,1),A)\rtimes\mathbb{R} \cong C_0(\mathbb{R})\otimes A\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ we arrive at the short exact sequence of C^*-algebras

$$0 \to C_0(\mathbb{R})\otimes A\rtimes\mathbb{R} \to C_0([0,1),A)\rtimes\mathbb{R} \to C_0(\mathbb{R})\otimes A \to 0. \tag{4}$$

This produces the Connes-Thom class $\alpha_{CT}\in KK^1(A,A\rtimes\mathbb{R})$. Similarly, using Takesaki-Takai duality $A\rtimes\mathbb{R}\rtimes\mathbb{R}\cong A\otimes\mathscr{K}$ one can construct $\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\in KK^1(A\rtimes\mathbb{R},A)$. The Connes-Thom isomorphisms on K-theory and K-homology comes from the following Kasparov products:

$$-\otimes\alpha_{CT} : K_*(A) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_{*+1}(A\rtimes\mathbb{R}) \quad\text{and}\quad \alpha_{CT}\otimes - : K^*(A\rtimes\mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K^{*+1}(A).$$

Observe that if $A = C(Z)$ and $Z\to X$ is a circle bundle, the short exact sequence (4) is $C(X)$-linear. Especially, the Connes-Thom isomorphisms are $K^*(X)$-linear.

We will construct projective cycles on the T-dual of a circle bundle $\pi_Z : Z\to X$ with $P = Z$. The crossed product $C(Z)\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ is a continuous trace algebra with spectrum $Z^T = X\times S^1$. Let us be a bit more precise and from an open subset $U\subseteq X$, a trivialization $g : \pi_Z^{-1}(U)\to U\times S^1$ and a $\theta_0\in S^1$ construct an isomorphism

$$g^* : \mathscr{A}(P^T)|_{g^{-1}(U\times S^1\setminus\{\theta_0\})} \cong U\times S^1\setminus\{\theta_0\}\times\mathscr{K}(L^2(S^1)).$$

The space $C_c(U\times S^1\times\mathbb{R})$ can (via g) be identified with a dense subset of all sections $g^{-1}(U\times S^1)\to\mathscr{A}(P^T)$ vanishing at the boundary. If $\theta\in\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}=S^1$ we define

$$\mathscr{H}_\theta:=\{f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}:\ f(t+1)=\mathrm{e}^{2\pi i\theta}f(t),\ \int_0^1|f|^2\mathrm{d}t<\infty\}.$$

It is clear that restriction to $[0,1)$ and periodic extension provides an isomorphism $\mathscr{H}_\theta\cong L^2(S^1)$. Now for any $(x,\theta)\in U\times S^1$ we have a mapping $\pi_{(x,\theta)}:\mathscr{A}(P^T)\to\mathscr{K}(\mathscr{H}_\theta)$ defined by means of the representation

$$\pi_{(x,\theta)}:C_c(U\times S^1\times\mathbb{R})\to\mathscr{K}(\mathscr{H}_\theta),\ \pi_{(x,\theta)}(a)f(t):=\int_{\mathbb{R}}a(x,t,t-r)f(r)\mathrm{d}r.$$

This construction shows that a choice of a trivializations of Z on a cover of X produces trivializations of P^T on the same cover of X.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that $\varphi:M\to Z$ is a continuous mapping to the total space of a circle bundle $\pi_Z:Z\to X$. We let $\tilde\varphi:M\times S^1\to Z$ denote the equivariant mapping $\tilde\varphi(m,\theta):=\theta\cdot\varphi(m)$. The crossed product construction produces a $PU(L^2(S^1))$-equivariant mapping $\tilde\varphi:M\times S^1\times PU(L^2(S^1))\to P^T$ which fits into the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} M\times S^1\times PU(\mathscr{H}) \arrow[r, "\tilde\varphi"] \arrow[d] & P^T \arrow[d] \\ M\times S^1 \arrow[r, "\pi_Z\varphi\times\mathrm{id}"] & X\times S^1 \end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. As $\tilde\varphi$ is $\mathbb{R}$-equivariant it induces a $*$-homomorphism

$$\tilde\varphi^*\rtimes\mathbb{R}:C(Z)\times\mathbb{R}\to C(M\times S^1)\rtimes\mathbb{R}=C(M\times S^1,\mathscr{K}(L^2(S^1))).$$

This gives the $PU(L^2(S^1))$-equivariant mapping $\tilde\varphi:M\times S^1\times PU(L^2(S^1))\to P^T$. It remains to prove that the mapping on the base is $\pi_Z\varphi\times\mathrm{id}$. If we identify $(m,\theta)\in M\times S^1$ with the representative $\pi_{(m,\theta)}$ for the class of (m,θ) in the spectrum of $C(M\times S^1)\rtimes\mathbb{R}$, we must show that

$$\tilde\varphi^*\pi_{(m,\theta)}=\pi_{(\pi_Z(\varphi(m)),\theta)},$$

where the right hand side is defined using some choice of trivialization for Z around x. The last equation now follows from a straight-forward calculation using this trivialization. □

Definition 4.2 (The projective T-dual of geometric cycle on circle bundle)**.** *If (M,E,φ) is a geometric cycle on the total space of a circle bundle $Z\to X$ we define its projective T-dual cycle $(M,E,\varphi)\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ on P^T by*

$$(M,E,\varphi)\rtimes\mathbb{R}:=(M\times S^1,E,\tilde\varphi),$$

where we identify E with its pullback to $M\times S^1$ and $\tilde\varphi:M\times S^1\times PU(L^2(S^1))\to P^T$ denotes the mapping of Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.3. *If $Z\to X$ is a circle bundle T-duality produces a well defined monomorphism $\rtimes\mathbb{R}:K_*^{geo}(Z)\to K_*^{proj}(P^T)$ that commutes with assembly mappings. That is, the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd} K_*^{geo}(Z) \arrow[r, "\rtimes\mathbb{R}"] \arrow[d, "\mu^Z"'] & K_*^{proj}(P^T) \arrow[d, "\mu^{P^T}"] \\ K_*^{an}(Z) \arrow[r, "\alpha_{CT}^{-1}"] & K_*^{an}(P^T) \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes. In particular, for flat Z this mapping is an isomorphism.

Proof. That $\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ is well defined is clear as it maps disjoint union to disjoint union, a vector bundle modification to a vector bundle modification and a bordism to a bordism.

There is an isomorphism $K^i(M\times S^1)\cong K^0(M)\oplus K^1(M)$ for $i=0,1$. Under these isomorphisms the Connes-Thom isomorphism is conjugate to a natural $K^*(M)$-linear automorphism of $K^*(M)\otimes\mathbb{Z}^2$. A consequence of this is that if E is the pullback of a vector bundle on M, $[E]\otimes\alpha_{CT}=i_![E]$ where $i:M\to M\times S^1$ denotes embedding in the first factor. This fact follows as naturality reduces the calculation to computing the Connes-Thom isomorphism for S^1.

We are now ready to compare $\mu^{P^T}\circ\rtimes\mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\circ\mu^Z$. If (M,E,φ) is a geometric cycle on Z, the consideration in the previous paragraph implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^{P^T}((M,E,\varphi)\rtimes\mathbb{R})&=\tilde{\varphi}_*([M\times S^1]\cap[E])=\tilde{\varphi}_*\circ\alpha_{CT}^{-1}([M\times S^1]\cap i_![E])=\\&=\tilde{\varphi}_*\circ\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\circ i_*([M]\cap[E])=\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\circ\tilde{\varphi}_*\circ i_*([M]\cap[E])=\\&=\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\circ\varphi_*([M]\cap[E])=\alpha_{CT}^{-1}\circ\mu^Z([M]\cap[E]).\end{aligned}$$

Here we use the naturality of the Connes-Thom mapping in the second row. ☐

Corollary 4.4. *If $Z\to X$ is a circle bundle with T-dual $PU(L^2(S^1))$-bundle $P^T\to X\times S^1$, the projective assembly mapping $\mu:K_*^{proj}(P^T)\to K_*^{an}(P^T)$ is a surjection.*

When X is smooth, this is an instance of a more general result, see Corollary 5.3.

4.2. Clutching construction for projective pseudo-differential operators.

The main motivation for introducing projective cycles is to obtain a geometric framework for dealing with the fractional indices of projective pseudo-differential operators. We will return to the subject of fractional indices later in the paper. In this subsection, we will very briefly recall projective pseudo-differential operators and show how an elliptic ditto fits into a projective cycle. The projective pseudo-differential operators can only be defined for a principal $PU(n)$-bundle. The reason is that if the twist is not torsion, there is an obstruction to deforming the associated Azumaya bundle (for more details see [9]).

To introduce projective pseudo-differential operators over P one needs an extension of $\mathscr{A}(P)$ to a neighborhood of the diagonal $\Delta\subseteq X\times X$ equipped with a multiplication mapping

$$\mathscr{A}(P)_{(x,y)}\times\mathscr{A}(P)_{(y,z)}\to\mathscr{A}(P)_{(x,z)}, \tag{5}$$

for any x,y,z such that all these pair of points lies in this neighborhood. Such an extension can be constructed if P is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle, see Proposition 4 of [23]. A projective pseudo-differential operator is a distribution with values in this extension that is polyhomogeneous conormal to the diagonal. Composition of two projective pseudo-differential operators is defined using (5) if the distributions are supported in small enough neighborhoods of the diagonal. The space of classical projective pseudo-differential operators between two projective bundles E_1 and E_2 over P is denoted by $\Psi^*(P;E_1,E_2)$, we will in the notation suppress the dependence on the neighborhood and always assume that compositions are defined.

An example of a projective pseudo-differential operator is the projective Dirac operator of an oriented manifold X. This is a projective operator over $Pr(X):=Fr(X)\times_{SO(n)}PU(2^m)$-the projective frames on X.

Let $T^*_\perp P$ denote the pullback of the cotangent bundle $T^*X\to X$ to P and $S^*_\perp P$ denote the pullback of the cosphere bundle $S^*X\to X$ up to P. With any $A\in\Psi^*(P;E_1,E_2)$, there is an associated symbol $\sigma(A)\in C^\infty(S^*_\perp P,\pi^*\mathrm{Hom}\,(E_1,E_2))$. Such an A is elliptic if and only if $\sigma(A)\in C^\infty(S^*_\perp P,\mathrm{Iso}(\pi^*E_1,\pi^*E_2))$. If A is elliptic, we can perform a clutching construction to associate a projective cycle with A.

Let $\pi : P \to X$ and $\pi_1 : \bar{B}^*_\perp P \to P$ denote the projection mappings. Observe that $T^*P \cong \pi^*T^*X \oplus \mathfrak{pu}(n)^*$, where $\mathfrak{pu}(n)$ denotes the Lie algebra of $PU(n)$, since the $PU(n)$-action on P is free. We have that

$$T^*\bar{B}^*_\perp P \oplus \mathfrak{pu}(n) \cong T^*(T^*P)|_{\bar{B}^*_\perp P},$$

and this isomorphism produces a $PU(n)$-invariant spin^c-structure, coming from the stably almost complex structure on T^*P and $\mathfrak{pu}(n)^*$.

Definition 4.5. *The clutching construction of an elliptic classical projective pseudodifferential operator A is defined as the projective cycle on P given by*

$$cl(A) := (S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1), E_A, \varphi),$$

where:

1. *We identify $S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1)$ with two copies of $\bar{B}^*_\perp P$ glued together along $S^*_\perp P$, and give $S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1)$ the spin^c-structure from this identification.*
2. *We define the vector bundle $E_A \to S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1)$ by gluing together $\pi_1^* E_1 \to \bar{B}^*_\perp P$ with $\pi_1^* E_2 \to \bar{B}^*_\perp P$ along $S^*_\perp P$ using $\sigma(A)$.*
3. *We let $\varphi : S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1) \to P$ denote the projection mapping.*

Proposition 4.6. *Assume that P is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle. The clutching construction produces a well defined mapping*

$$c : K^*_{proj}(T^*_\perp P) \to K^{proj}_*(P).$$

Proof. It is clear that the clutching construction respects isomorphisms. Furthermore, an elementary projective elliptic complex (E, E, id) is mapped to the boundary $\partial(B(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1), \varphi^* E, \varphi)$, where we abuse notation and let $\varphi : B(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1) \to P$ denote the projection mapping. ☐

Theorem 4.7. *Assume that P is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle. The clutching construction fits into the commutative diagram where all maps are isomorphisms:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & K^*_{proj}(T^*_\perp P) \arrow[dl, "c"'] \arrow[dr, "Op"] & \\
K^{proj}_*(P) \arrow[rr, "\mu"] & & K^{an}_*(P)
\end{tikzcd}$$

In particular, c is an isomorphism.

Proof. Recall that Op is defined in Section 3 of [15]. The proof follows from Kasparov's index theorem (Theorem 5 of [19]) and Poincaré duality. ☐

5. Twisted geometric K-homology

There is also a relationship between projective and twisted geometric K-homology. Twisted geometric cycles are defined in the more general setting of a principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle $P \to X$ for a separable Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. Recall from [28] that a twisted geometric cycle is a quintuple $(M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta)$, where M_0 is a manifold with stabilized normal bundle $\nu : M_0 \to BSO(\infty)$, $E_0 \in K^0(M_0)$, $\varphi_0 : M_0 \to X$ a continuous mapping such that

$$\varphi_0^*\delta(P) + W_3(\nu) = 0 \in H^3(M_0, \mathbb{Z}) = [M_0, BPU(\mathscr{H})]$$

through an explicit homotopy $\eta : [0,1] \times M_0 \to BPU(\mathscr{H})$. The homotopy η induces a $PU(\mathscr{H})$-equivariant mapping

$$\hat{\eta} : Pr_s(\nu) \to \varphi_0^* P.$$

The twisted geometric K-homology $K_*^{geo}(P)$ of a principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle P is defined as the set of isomorphism classes of twisted geometric cycles modulo direct sum/disjoint union, vector bundle modification and bordism. It forms an abelian group under disjoint union and is graded by the dimension of the manifold in the cycle.

The geometric assembly mapping $\mu_{geo} : K_*^{geo}(P) \to K_*^{an}(P)$ is defined by

$$\mu_{geo}(M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta) = (\varphi_0)_* \hat{\eta}^*([M_0] \cap [E_0]).$$

Theorem 6.4 of [28] states that the geometric assembly mapping is an isomorphism for any principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle over a smooth manifold X. The requirement that X is smooth is crucial for the construction of geometric cycles in the proof of Theorem 6.4 in [28].

5.1. **The geometric modification mapping.** We can construct the principal bundle $Pr(\nu)$ as follows. Representing ν as a mapping $M_0 \to BSO(k)$ with k even, we obtain an $SO(k)$-bundle $Fr(\nu) \to M_0$ of frames on the stable normal bundle. The principal bundle $Pr(\nu) \to M_0$ is the fiber product of the $SO(k)$-bundle $Fr(\nu) \to M_0$ with $PU(2^k)$. Note that the fiber product is taken over the projective spin^c-representation of $SO(k)$. The stabilization of $Pr(\nu)$ is denoted by $Pr_s(\nu)$ (i.e., $Pr_s(\nu) := Pr(\nu) \times_{PU(2^k)} PU(\mathscr{H})$).

Proposition 5.1. *The homotopy η induces an equivariant mapping*

$$\varphi^0_{\nu\eta} : Pr_s(\nu) \to P$$

Proof. As η is a homotopy from $\varphi_0^*\delta(P)$ to $W_3(\nu)$ it induces a $PU(\mathscr{H})$-equivariant mapping $\hat{\eta} : Pr_s(\nu) \to \varphi_0^*P$. The stable equivariant morphism $\varphi^0_{\nu\eta} : Pr_s(\nu) \to P$ is defined by means of the composition

$$Pr_s(\nu) \xrightarrow{\hat{\eta}} \varphi_0^* P \to P$$

where the latter is projection onto the first coordinate when writing $\varphi_0^* P = P \times_X M_0$. ☐

If $(M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta)$ is a twisted geometric K-homology cycle, we pull back ν to a mapping $\tilde{\nu} : S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1) \to BSO(k)$ and set

$$M_\nu := Pr(\tilde{\nu}) = \pi^* Pr(\nu),$$

where $\pi : S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1) \to M_0$ denotes the projection mapping. We give the total space M_ν of this $PU(2^k)$-principal bundle over the spin^c-manifold $S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)$ the induced spin^c-structure from $S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)$. Let $s : M_0 \to S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)$ denote the south pole map. It is clear that

$$s^* M_\nu = Pr(\nu).$$

Since we have choosen a spin^c-structure on $S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)$, we can define $E_\nu \in K^0_{proj}(M_\nu)$ as the image of E under the push forward

$$s_! : K^0(M_0) \to K^0(S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1), \delta(M_\nu) + W_3(S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)))$$

and the isomorphisms

$$K^0(S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1), \delta(M_\nu) + W_3(S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1))) \cong K^0(S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1), \delta(M_\nu)) \cong K^*_{proj}(M_\nu).$$

Here we only indicate the Dixmier-Douady class of the involved Azumaya bundles to shorten notation. We let $\varphi_{\nu\eta} : M_\nu \to P$ be the stable equivariant morphism defined from

$$M_\nu \to Pr(\nu) \xrightarrow{\varphi^0_{\nu\eta}} P.$$

Using these constructions, we define the geometric modification mapping on the semigroup of twisted geometric cycles

$$\delta(M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta) = (M_\nu, E_\nu, \varphi_{\nu\eta}).$$

The reader will note that there are a few choices in the definition of this map (i.e., in the construction of the cycle, $(M_\nu, E_\nu, \varphi_{\nu\eta})$). Thus, technically, the map is not defined as a map from cycles to cycles; of course, as the reader can check, it is well-defined as a map from cycles to classes. The next proposition implies that this map induces a map at the level of geometric K-homology groups (i.e., from classes to classes).

Theorem 5.2. *If $P \to X$ is a principal $PU(\mathcal{H})$-bundle, the geometric modification mapping induces a well defined mapping $\delta : K_*^{geo}(P) \to K_*^{proj}(P)$ that fits into the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& K_*^{geo}(P) \arrow[dl, "\delta"'] \arrow[dr, "\mu_{geo}"] & \\
K_*^{proj}(P) \arrow[rr, "\mu"] & & K_*^{an}(P)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6}$$

.

Proof. Let us start by proving that δ respects the relations in $K_*^{geo}(P)$. It is clear that δ respects direct sum/disjoint union. If $(W_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta)$ is a twisted geometric cycle with boundary, it is clear that we can construct a projective cycle with boundary $(W_\nu, E_\nu, \varphi_{\nu\eta})$ in the same manner as above and $\delta\partial(W_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta) = \partial(W_\nu, E_\nu, \varphi_{\nu\eta})$ is null bordant. Similarly, it is standard to show that if $V \to M_0$ is an even-dimensional spin^c-vector bundle and letting $\pi_V : M^V := S(V \oplus 1) \to M_0$ and $\tilde{\pi}_V : (M_\nu)^{\pi^*V} := S(\pi^*V \oplus 1) \to M_\nu$ denote the projections, there is a bordism

$$\delta(M^V, E_0 \otimes \beta_V, \varphi_0 \pi_V, \nu_V, \eta_V) \sim ((M_\nu)^{\pi^*V}, E_\nu \otimes \beta_{\pi^*V}, \varphi_{\nu\eta} \circ \tilde{\pi}_V).$$

Now we turn to proving that the diagram commutes. If $(M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta)$ is a twisted geometric cycle, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \circ \delta[M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta] &= (\varphi_{\nu\eta})_{0*}([S(T^*M_0 \oplus 1)] \cap s_![E_0]) = \\ &= (\varphi^0_{\nu\eta})_{0*}([M] \cap [E_0]) = \mu_{geo}[M_0, E_0, \varphi_0, \nu, \eta]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 5.3. *Let $P \to X$ be a principal $PU(\mathcal{H})$-bundle. Then,*

1. *When $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^n$ and X is a finite CW-complex μ_{geo} is an isomorphism if and only if $\delta : K_*^{geo}(P) \to K_*^{proj}(P)$ is an isomorphism.*
2. *The geometric modification mapping $\delta : K_*^{geo}(X, \delta(P)) \to K_*^{proj}(P)$ is an injection if and only if μ_{geo} is an injection.*
3. *The projective assembly mapping $\mu : K_*^{proj}(P) \to K_*^{an}(P)$ is a surjection if and only if μ_{geo} is a surjection.*

Furthermore, if X is a smooth manifold, μ is surjective and δ is injective.

Proof. That δ is an isomorphism for principal $PU(n)$-bundles over finite CW-complexes if and only if μ_{geo} is an isomorphism follows from Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 3.6, since $\delta^{-1} = \mu_{geo}^{-1} \circ \mu$ and $\mu_{geo}^{-1} = \delta^{-1}\mu^{-1}$. Similarly, as $\mu \circ \delta = \mu_{geo}$, δ is injective if and only if μ_{geo} is and μ surjective if and only if μ_{geo} is. The final statement of the corollary concerning smooth manifolds follows from the previous observations and Theorem 6.4 of [28]. □

5.2. **Geometric T-duality for geometric cycles.** In Subsection 4.1, we considered T-dual projective cycles. This construction can also be done but with target twisted geometric K-homology.

Definition 5.4 (The twisted geometric T-dual of geometric cycle on a circle bundle)**.** *If (M,E,φ) is a geometric cycle on the total space of a circle bundle $Z\to X$ we define its twisted geometric T-dual cycle $(M,E,\varphi)\rtimes_{geo}\mathbb{R}$ on P^T by*

$$(M,E,\varphi)\rtimes_{geo}\mathbb{R}:=(M\times S^1,E,\pi_Z\circ\varphi\times\mathrm{id},\nu_{M\times S^1},\eta_{\tilde{\varphi}}),$$

where

1. *We identify E with its pullback to $M\times S^1$.*
2. *The mapping $\nu_{M\times S^1}:M\times S^1\to BSO(\infty)$ comes from the spin^c-structure on M and the standard spin^c-structure on S^1.*
3. *The homotopy $\eta_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ is constructed from the spin^c-structure on M and the $PU(\mathscr{H})$-equivariant mapping $\tilde{\varphi}:M\times S^1\times PU(\mathscr{H})\to P^T$ of Proposition 4.1.*

Proposition 5.5. *If $Z\to X$ is a circle bundle T-duality produces a well defined monomorphism $\rtimes_{geo}\mathbb{R}:K_*^{geo}(Z)\to K_*^{geo}(P^T)$ that commutes with assembly mappings. So the following diagram commutes;*

$$\begin{tikzcd} K_*^{geo}(Z) \arrow[r, "\rtimes_{geo}\mathbb{R}"] \arrow[d, "\mu"'] & K_*^{geo}(P^T) \arrow[d, "\mu_{geo}"] \\ K_*^{an}(Z) \arrow[r, "\alpha_{CT}^{-1}"] & K_*^{an}(P^T) \end{tikzcd}$$

In particular, the assembly mapping in twisted geometric K-homology is a surjection for P^T.

The fact that the assembly mapping is a surjection in this case also follows from Corollary 4.4 and Corollary 5.3. The proof of this Proposition goes along the same lines as Proposition 4.3, so we shall not prove this. The difference being that the equivariance property is hidden away in the homotopy $\eta_{\tilde{\varphi}}$.

5.3. **The twisted index pairing.** On page 154 of [4] *the index problem* was defined for abstract elliptic operators on a CW-complex, i.e. an analytic K-homology class. Analagously, we define the projective index problem.

The projective index problem. *If $x\in K_*^{an}(P)$, find a projective cycle (M,E,φ) such that $\mu(M,E,\varphi)=x$.*

This problem has previously been studied in the context of the twisted index pairing using twisted geometric cycles in [11], the description in projective K-homology is very similar.

Proposition 5.6. *If X is smooth and (M,E,φ) solves the projective index problem for $x\in K_*^{an}(P)$ then*

$$\mathrm{ind}\,(x\cap y)=\int_{M/PU(k)}\mathrm{ch}_M[E]\wedge\varphi^*\mathrm{ch}_{P^*}(y)\wedge\hat{A}(M)\quad \textit{for}\quad y\in K^*_{proj}(P^{op}).$$

The proof of this Proposition can be carried out word by word as in the proof of Theorem 6.1 of [11].

6. Fractional index theory

One of the reasons to introduce geometric K-homology was the need for a more geometric homology theory describing the Atiyah-Singer index theorem. In this section we will study how one can use projective K-homology to describe the fractional index in a geometric way. As mentioned in the introduction, this problem was the starting point for considering the construction of projective cycles.

6.1. **The fractional index.** In this subsection, we take a closer look at the fractional index. Let us first recall the motivation coming from the fractional analytic index of projective pseudo-differential operators. If A is an elliptic projective pseudo-differential operator, see Subsection 4.2 or [24], with parametrix R, the projective operator $[A,R]$ is a projective smoothing operator and one defines the fractional analytic index of A by

$$\mathrm{ind}_a(A) := \mathrm{tr}[A,R] \in \mathbb{C}.$$

This does not depend on the choice of parametrix since we are dealing with a tracial functional. A priori this is only an invariant of A which takes complex values. However, much more can be said about this invariant.

Theorem 6.1 (Theorem 4 of [24]). *The fractional analytic index of an elliptic projective pseudo-differential operator A over a principal $PU(n)$-bundle is fractional and given by the formula*

$$\mathrm{ind}_a(A) = \int_{T^*X} \mathrm{ch}_{\pi^*P}[\sigma(A)] \wedge Td(X).$$

Motivated by Theorem 6.1, we define the fractional index $\mathrm{ind}_f : K^*_{proj}(P) \to \mathbb{Q}$ for $P \to X$ a smooth principal $PU(n)$-bundle over a closed manifold by

$$\mathrm{ind}_f(E) := \int_X \mathrm{ch}_P[E] \wedge \hat{A}(X).$$

So the content of Theorem 6.1 is that $\mathrm{ind}_a(A) = \mathrm{ind}_f[\sigma(A)]$ since $\hat{A}(T^*X) = Td(X)$.

Definition 6.2 (The projective index). *Let $P \to X$ be a principal $PU(n)$-bundle and (M,E,φ) be a projective cycle over P. We define the projective index of (M,E,φ) via*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{proj}(M,E,\varphi) := \int_{M/PU(k)} \mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P}[\Psi_\varphi E] \wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k)) \in \mathbb{R},$$

where Ψ_φ denotes the stable isomorphism $\varphi_0^*P \cong M$ associated with φ.

Our aim is of course to show that the projective index gives a well defined mapping on projective K-homology. It is instructive to consider the situation when $P \to X$ is a smooth principal $PU(n)$-bundle with a compatible spin^c-structure. Every cycle (M,E,φ) can be uniquely represented by the cycle $(P, \varphi_! E, \mathrm{id})$ in $K_*^{proj}(P)$ because of Poincaré duality. So we must show that the projective index of the two coincide.

From the twisted Riemann-Roch Theorem, see Theorem 5.3 and the remarks thereafter in [11], we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ind}_{proj}(M,E,\varphi) &= \int_{M/PU(k)} \operatorname{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P}[\Psi_\varphi E]\wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k)) = \\
&= \int_X (\varphi_0)_*\Big(\operatorname{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P}[\Psi_\varphi E]\wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k))\Big) = \\
&= \int_X \operatorname{ch}_P(\varphi_0)_!\Psi_\varphi[E]\wedge \hat{A}(X) = \int_X \operatorname{ch}_P \varphi_![E]\wedge \hat{A}(X) = \\
&= \operatorname{ind}_{proj}(P,\varphi_! E,\mathrm{id}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6.3. *For any $PU(n)$-bundle, the projective index gives a well defined mapping*

$$\operatorname{ind}_{proj}: K_*^{proj}(P)\to \mathbb{Q}.$$

Proof. Since Chern characters on the projective K-theory of a $PU(n)$-bundle takes values in rational cohomology, it is clear that the projective index takes rational values. We must show that the projective index respects the three relations in K_*^{proj}. It is obvious that the projective index respects direct sums.

To prove that the projective index respects vector bundle modification, assume that $V_0 \to M/PU(k)$ is an even-dimensional spin^c vector bundle and as usual let $V := \pi^* V_0$. Then, by the twisted Riemann-Roch Theorem (Theorem 5.3 in [11]),

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ind}_{proj}(M,E,\varphi)^V &= \int_{S(V_0\oplus 1)} \operatorname{ch}_{(\pi^V)^*\varphi^*P}\left[\Psi_{\varphi\circ\pi^V} s_! E\right]\wedge \hat{A}(S(V_0\oplus 1)) = \\
&= \int_{S(V_0\oplus 1)} \operatorname{ch}_{(\pi^V)^*\varphi^*P}\left[s_!\Psi_\varphi E\right]\wedge \hat{A}(S(V_0\oplus 1)) = \\
&= \int_{S(V_0\oplus 1)} s_*\Big(\operatorname{ch}_{\varphi^*P}\left[\Psi_\varphi E\right]\wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k))\Big) = \operatorname{ind}_{proj}(M,E,\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

To verify that the projective index respects bordism, we observe that if (W,E,φ) is a projective cycle with boundary, $\Psi_\varphi[E]|_{\partial W} = \Psi_{\varphi|_{\partial W}}[E|_{\partial W}]$ and

$$\hat{A}(W/PU(k))|_{\partial W/PU(k)} = \hat{A}(\partial W/PU(k)).$$

Stokes Theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ind}_{proj}(\partial W, E|_{\partial W},\varphi|_{\partial W}) &= \int_{\partial W/PU(k)} \operatorname{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P}[\Psi_\varphi E]\wedge \hat{A}(W/PU(k)) = \\
&= \int_{W/PU(k)} \mathrm{d}\Big(\operatorname{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P}[\Psi_\varphi E]\wedge \hat{A}(W/PU(k))\Big) = 0, \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, since P is a $PU(n)$-bundle, the Chern character of a projective bundle is a closed form. ☐

In the proof that the projective index respects bordism, we see the assumption that P must be a principal $PU(n)$-bundle. This observation will be considered in more detail in the next section.

Definition 6.4 (The twisted geometric index). *Let $P\to X$ be a principal $PU(n)$-bundle and (M,E,φ,ν,η) be a twisted geometric cycle. We define the twisted geometric index of (M,E,φ,ν,η) as*

$$\operatorname{ind}_{geo}(M,E,\varphi) := \int_{M/PU(k)} \operatorname{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu)}[\Psi_\eta E]\wedge \hat{A}(X)\in \mathbb{R},$$

where Ψ_η *denotes the stable isomorphism* $\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu)\cong M$ *associated with* η*.*

Proposition 6.5. *If* P *is a* $PU(n)$*-bundle, the twisted geometric index gives a well defined mapping*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{geo}:K_*^{geo}(P)\to\mathbb{Q}.$$

Proof. The proof goes along the same lines as Proposition 6.3. We need to show that the three relations are respected. It is obvious that the projective index respects direct sums.

To prove that the twisted geometric index respects vector bundle modification, assume that $V\to M$ is an even-dimensional spin^c vector bundle and (M,E,φ,ν,η) a twisted geometric cycle. Then, by the twisted Riemann-Roch Theorem (Theorem 5.3 in [11]),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ind}_{geo}(M,E,\varphi,\nu,\eta)^V&=\int_{S(V\oplus 1)}\mathrm{ch}_{(\pi^V)^*\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu^V)}\left[\Psi_{\eta^V}s_!E\right]\wedge\hat{A}(S(V\oplus 1))=\\&=\int_{S(V\oplus 1)}\mathrm{ch}_{(\pi^V)^*\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu^V)}\left[s_!\Psi_\eta E\right]\wedge\hat{A}(S(V\oplus 1))=\\&=\int_{S(V\oplus 1)}s_*\left(\mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu)}\left[\Psi_\eta E\right]\wedge\hat{A}(M)\right)=\mathrm{ind}_{geo}(M,E,\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

The bordism invariance of the twisted geometric index is proved exactly as in Proposition 6.3. It again uses the fact that, when P is a $PU(n)$-bundle, the Chern character maps to closed form. □

Theorem 6.6. *The geometric, projective and fractional index coincide in the following sense. If* $P\to X$ *is a principal* $PU(n)$*-bundle the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & K_*^{proj}(P) \arrow[dd, "\mathrm{ind}_{proj}"] & \\
K^*_{proj}(T^*_\perp P) \arrow[ur, "c"] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{ind}_f"'] & & K_*^{geo}(P) \arrow[ul, "\delta"'] \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{ind}_{geo}"] \\
 & \mathbb{Q} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. If (M,E,φ,ν,η) is a geometric cycle the twisted Riemann-Roch Theorem (Theorem 5.3 in [11]) implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ind}_{proj}\left(\delta(M,E,\varphi,\nu,\eta)\right)&=\int_{S(T^*M\oplus 1)}\mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_{\nu\eta}^*P}[\Psi_{\varphi_{\nu\eta}}s_!E]\wedge\hat{A}(S(T^*M\oplus 1))=\\&=\int_{S(T^*M\oplus 1)}\mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_{\nu\eta}^*P}[s_!\Psi_\eta E]\wedge\hat{A}(S(T^*M\oplus 1))=\\&=\int_{S(T^*M\oplus 1)}s_*\left(\mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_0^*P\cdot Fr(-\nu)}[\Psi_\eta E]\wedge\hat{A}(M)\right)=\\&=\mathrm{ind}_{geo}(M,E,\varphi,\nu,\eta).\end{aligned}$$

That the left hand side commutes is a consequence of the twisted Riemann-Roch Theorem and the fact that

$$[cl(A)]=[S(T^*_\perp P\oplus 1),s_![\sigma(A)],\varphi],$$

as in [4]. The mapping $s : T^*_\perp P \to S(T^*_\perp P \oplus 1)$ is defined as the obvious embedding. □

6.2. **The problem with non-torsion Dixmier-Duoady invariants.** An interesting question is whether fractional index theory exists for general $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundles. There is not really an obvious index formula in this setting. In particular, the twisted Chern character does not take values in a cohomology group that is isomorphic to de Rham cohomology, so we can not integrate. This can be explained by the fact that we can not push forward to a point since this map does not respect the twist.

On the analytic side there are problems in constructing a fractional index for infinite-dimensional $\mathscr{H}$ as there exists obstructions to defining projective pseudo-differential operators. It follows from Theorem 8.1.1 of [9] that it is not possible to construct projective pseudo-differential operators over a principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle when the Dixmier-Douady invariant is non-torsion. To be more precise, one can not construct a symbolic calculus in this case. It is however possible to construct a pseudo-differential calculus for describing the twisted index pairing, see [15].

Similarly, there are problems in having a well defined fractional index in the geometric models for twisted K-homology. We will now discuss these problems. As the same type of problems arise in both geometric twisted K-homology as in projective K-homology, we focus on the latter.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $M \to X$ be a principal $PU(n)$-bundle, $P \to X$ be a principal $PU(\mathscr{H})$-bundle and $\varphi : M \to P$ be a stable isomorphism. Then, there is an even degree form ω_φ (uniquely determined modulo exact forms by φ) making the following diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K^*_{proj}(M) \arrow[r, "\Psi_\varphi"] \arrow[d, "\mathrm{ch}_M"'] & K^*_{proj}(P) \arrow[d, "\mathrm{ch}_P"] \\
H^*_{dR}(X) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{e}^{\omega_\varphi}"] & H^*_{\Omega(P)}(X)
\end{tikzcd} .$$

Proof. By [26] the twisted Chern character is a complex isomorphism so $\mathrm{e}^{\omega_\varphi}$ exists. If we have two such isomorphisms $\mathrm{e}^{\omega_\varphi}$ and $\mathrm{e}^{\omega'_\varphi}$, the form $\mathrm{e}^{\omega_\varphi - \omega'_\varphi}$ is closed and its cohomology class is 1, that is $\omega_\varphi - \omega'_\varphi$ is exact. □

From Lemma 6.7, we see exactly why the definition of the projective index breaks down for non-torsion Dixmier-Duoady invariant. Namely, the mapping Ψ_φ is in general implemented by a non-closed form. Thus the bordism relation need not be respected by the projective index for non-torsion twists.

Being that it is the mapping Ψ_φ that causes problems with the projective index let us consider a definition of an index where Ψ_φ is not included. We define the naive projective index

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{ind}}_{proj}(M, E, \varphi) := \int_{M/PU(k)} \mathrm{ch}_M[E] \wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The tilde symbolizes how naive this definition is. We make the following observation based on the proof of Proposition 6.3.

Proposition 6.8. *The naive projective index respects direct sum/disjoint union and bordism relation but in general not vector bundle modification.*

This can be seen already when there is no twist present since the naive projective index does not depend on the mapping part of the cycle. A concrete example can be constructed by taking the space $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with no twist at all. The cycle $(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C}, \mathrm{id})$ is a projective cycle over $\mathbb{C}P^2$ whose naive projective index is

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{ind}}_{proj}(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C}, \mathrm{id}) = \hat{A}(\mathbb{C}P^2) = -\frac{1}{8}.$$

However, it is clear that $\widetilde{\mathrm{ind}}_{proj}(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C}, \mathrm{id})$ does not depend on the mapping $\mathrm{id} : \mathbb{C}P^2 \to \mathbb{C}P^2$ and so it can be computed from the cycle $(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C})$ over a point. If the naive projective index were to respect vector bundle modification, it would only depend on the class of $(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C})$ in $K_*^{geo}(pt)$. But $K_*^{geo}(pt) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ and the isomorphism is given by taking the index of the spin^c Dirac operator. Hence $(\mathbb{C}P^2, \mathbb{C}P^2 \times \mathbb{C})$ is equivalent to $(pt, pt \times \mathbb{C})$ in $K_*^{geo}(pt)$. However;

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{ind}}_{proj}(pt, pt \times \mathbb{C}) = 1.$$

We can conclude that the naive projective index is not preserved under vector bundle modification.

6.3. **The associated rational classes.** We will in this subsection make the standard assumption that $P \to X$ is a principal $PU(n)$-bundle. It follows from the rational Chern character being an isomorphism that $K_*^{proj}(P;\mathbb{Q}) \cong K_*(X;\mathbb{Q})$. We construct this isomorphism explicitly. To begin, the reader should recall that the group $K_*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ can be realized using cycles of the following form:

Definition 6.9. *Let X be a compact Hausdorff space and denote by D the UHF-algebra with K_0-group the rational numbers (compare to Exercise 23.15.6 of [8]). Then a rational K-cycle over X is a triple, (M, ξ, f), where M is a smooth compact spin^c-manifold, $\xi \in K^0(X;\mathbb{Q}) \cong K^0(C(X) \otimes D)$, and $f : M \to X$ is a continuous map.*

Such cycles are defined using K-theory classes rather than bundles. As such, there are only two relations, bordism and vector bundle modification. We will let the set of equivalence classes of rational K-cycles over X under the relation generated by bordism and vector bundle modification be denoted by $K_*(X;\mathbb{Q})$; it forms a group under the obvious disjoint union operation. The interested reader can find more details on these cycles and associated geometric realization of $KK^*(C(X), D) \cong K_*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ in [27]. We will use E^n to denote the n^{th} iterated tensor product.

Proposition 6.10. *If E is a vector bundle on a d-dimensional manifold X whose rank has an n^{th} root, the rational vector bundle*

$$\sqrt[n]{E} := \sqrt[n]{rk(E)} + \sum_{k=1}^{d} \binom{1/n}{k} (E - rk(E))^k$$

is well defined and satisfies $E = \sqrt[n]{E}^n$. Any vector bundle F satisfies $F = \sqrt[n]{F^n}$ in $K^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$. Furthermore, roots commutes with Chern characters.

We leave the details to the reader who should note the Taylor expansion:

$$(1+x)^\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{k} x^k, \quad \text{for} \quad |x| < 1.$$

If E is a projective vector bundle over a principal $PU(n)$-bundle, we define its rationalization $[E]_\mathbb{Q}$ as the rational K-theory class

$$[E]_\mathbb{Q} := \sqrt[n]{E^n}.$$

This definition produces an element of $K^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ using the fact that E^n descends to a vector bundle on X.

Proposition 6.11. *Rationalization of projective bundles induces a well defined mapping $K^*_{proj}(P) \to K^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ which is a rational isomorphism.*

Proof. Since $\mathrm{ch}\,[E]_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathrm{ch}_P[E]$ and the Chern character is a rational isomorphism, $[E] \mapsto [E]_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is both additive and a rational isomorphism. □

If M is a spin^c-manifold we let $L^{W_3}(M) \to M$ denote the determinant line bundle associated with the spin^c-structure. To be precise, if $Fr^c(M) \to M$ denotes the principle spin^c-bundle that lifts the frame bundle $Fr(M) \to M$, the determinant bundle is $Fr^c(M) \times_{Spin^c} U(1)$.

Proposition 6.12. *In the notation of the previous paragraph, we have*

$$\mathrm{ch}\,[\sqrt{L^{W_3}(M)}]_{\mathbb{Q}} \wedge Td(M) = \hat{A}(M).$$

Proof. The proof of the Proposition follows by observing $\mathrm{e}^{c_1(L^{W_3}(M))/2} \wedge Td(M) = \hat{A}(M)$. □

Definition 6.13. *If (M,E,φ) is a projective cycle we define its rationalization as the geometric rational K-cycle over X given by*

$$(M,E,\varphi)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \left(M/PU(k), [\Psi_\varphi E]_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \sqrt{L^{W_3}(M/PU(k))}, \varphi_0\right).$$

Proposition 6.14. *Rationalization of projective cycles induces a well defined mapping $R : K_*^{proj}(P) \to K_*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ which is a rational isomorphism.*

Proof. It is clear from Proposition 6.11 and the fact that the assembly mapping is an isomorphism, that if the mapping is well defined, it is a rational isomorphism. That the rationalization is well defined is a standard verification that we leave to the reader. □

Theorem 6.15. *If $P \to X$ is a principle $PU(n)$-bundle, the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_*^{proj}(P) \arrow[rr, "R"] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{ind}_{proj}"'] & & K_*(X;\mathbb{Q}) \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{ind}_{\mathbb{Q}}"] \\
& \mathbb{Q} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{ind}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left([L] \cap (M,E,\varphi)_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) = \\
&= \int_{M/PU(k)} \mathrm{ch}\left([L^{W_3}(M/PU(k))]_{\mathbb{Q}} \cup [\Psi_\varphi E]_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) \wedge Td(M/PU(k)) = \\
&= \int_{M/PU(k)} \mathrm{ch}_{\varphi_0^* P}\left(\Psi_\varphi[E]\right) \wedge \hat{A}(M/PU(k)) = \mathrm{ind}_{proj}(M,E,\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to express their gratitude towards P. Baum, A. Carey and B.-L. Wang for discussions and access to the preprint [3]. The first listed author was supported by an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship. The second author gratefully acknowledges support by the Institut Mittag-Leffler (Djursholm, Sweden). Both authors thank the Courant Centre of Göttingen, the Leibniz Universität Hannover and the Graduiertenkolleg 1463 (*Analysis, Geometry and String Theory*) for facilitating this collaboration.

References

[1] M. F. Atiyah, *Global theory of elliptic operators*, 1970 Proc. Internat. Conf. on Functional Analysis and Related Topics (Tokyo, 1969) p. 21–30 Univ. of Tokyo Press, Tokyo.

[2] M. F. Atiyah, I. M. Singer, *The index of elliptic operators I*, Ann. of Math. (2) 87 (1968), p. 484–530.

[3] P. Baum, A. Carey, B.-L. Wang, *K-cycles for twisted K-homology*, preprint 2012.

[4] P. Baum, R.G. Douglas, *K-homology and index theory*, Operator algebras and applications, Part I (Kingston, Ont., 1980), p. 117–173, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 38, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1982.

[5] P. Baum, N. Higson, T. Schick, *On the equivalence of geometric and analytic K-homology*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. 3 (2007), no. 1, part 3, p. 1–24.

[6] P. Baum, H. Oyono-Oyono, T. Schick, M. Walter, *Equivariant geometric K-homology for compact Lie group actions*, Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hambg. 80 (2010), no. 2, p. 149–173.

[7] P. F. Baum, E. van Erp, *K-homology and index theory on contact manifolds*, arXiv:1107.1741.

[8] B. Blackadar: K-theory for operator algebras, Second edition. Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, 5. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. xx+300 pp. ISBN: 0-521-63532-2.

[9] P. Bressler, A. Gorokhovsky, R. Nest, B. Tsygan, *Deformation quantization of gerbes*, Adv. Math. 214 (2007), no. 1, p. 230–266.

[10] A. L. Carey, B.-L. Wang, *Thom isomorphism and push-forward map in twisted K-theory*, Journal of K-theory: K-theory and its Applications to Algebra, Geometry, and Topology, 1 , p. 357–393.

[11] A. L. Carey, B.-L Wang, *Riemann-Roch and index formulae in twisted K-theory*, Superstrings, geometry, topology, and C^*-algebras, p. 95–131, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 81, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.

[12] R. J. Deeley, *Geometric K-homology with coefficients I*, J. K-Theory, 9 (2012), no. 3, p. 537–564.

[13] R. J. Deeley, *Geometric K-homology with coefficients II*, arXiv:1101.0703.

[14] R. J. Deeley, *$\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-valued index theory via geometric K-homology*, arXiv:1206.5662.

[15] M. Goffeng, *Operator-valued pseudo-differential operators and the twisted index pairing*, arXiv: 1011.5800.

[16] A. Grothendieck, *Le groupe de Brauer. I. Algebres d'Azumaya et interpretations diverses*, Seminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 9, Exp. No. 290, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1995, pp. 199–219.

[17] N. Higson, J. Roe, *K-homology, assembly and rigidity theorems for relative eta invariants*, Pure Appl. Math. Q., 6 (2010), no. 2, Special Issue: In honor of Michael Atiyah and Isadore Singer, p. 555–601.

[18] J. Lott, *R/Z index theory*, Comm. Anal. Geom., 2 (1994), p. 279–311.

[19] G.G. Kasparov, *Operator K-theory and its applications: elliptic operators, group representations, higher signatures, C^*-extensions*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Warsaw, 1983), 987–1000, PWN, Warsaw, 1984.

[20] G. G. Kasparov, *Equivariant KK-theory and the Novikov conjecture*, Invent. Math. 91 (1988), no. 1, p. 147–201.

[21] N. Keswani, *Geometric K-homology and controlled paths*, New York J. Math. 5 (1999), p. 53–81.

[22] M. Marcolli, V. Mathai, *Twisted index theory on good orbifolds. I. Noncommutative Bloch theory*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 1 (1999), no. 4, p. 553–587.

[23] V. Mathai, R. B. Melrose, I. M. Singer, *The index of projective families of elliptic operators*, Geom. Topol. 9 (2005), p. 341–373.

[24] V. Mathai, R.B. Melrose, I.M. Singer, *Fractional analytic index*, J. Differential Geom. 74 (2006), no. 2, p. 265–292.

[25] J. Rosenberg, *Topology, C^*-algebras, and string duality*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, 111. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009. viii+110 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4922-4

[26] V. Mathai, D. Stevenson, *On a generalized Connes-Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg theorem*, Adv. Math. 200 (2006), no. 2, p. 303–335.

[27] M. Walter, *Equivariant geometric K-homology with coefficients*, Diplomarbeit University of Goettingen, 2010.

[28] B.-L. Wang, *Geometric cycles, index theory and twisted K-homology*, J. Noncommut. Geom. 2 (2008), no. 4, p. 497–552.

Robin J. Deeley,
Mathematisches Institut, Georg-August Universität Göttingen
Bunsenstrasse 3-5
D-37073 Göttingen
Germany

Magnus Goffeng,
Institut für Analysis, Leibniz Universität Hannover
301 67 Hannover
Germany